arXiv:1606.09331v1 [quant-ph] 30 Jun 2016

# Composites and Categories of Euclidean Jordan Algebras

Howard Barnum[*†], Matthew Graydon[‡§¶] and Alexander Wilce[‖]

June 27, 2016

**Abstract**

We consider possible non-signaling composites of probabilistic models based on euclidean Jordan algebras (EJAs), satisfying some reasonable additional constraints motivated by the desire to construct dagger-compact categories of such models. We show that no such composite exists having the exceptional Jordan algebra as a direct summand, nor does any such composite exist if either factor is exceptional. Moreover, we show that any composite of simple, non-exceptional EJAs is a direct summand of their universal tensor product, sharply limiting the possibilities.

These results warrant our focussing on concrete Jordan algebras of hermitian matrices, i.e., euclidean Jordan algebras with a preferred embedding in a complex matrix algebra. We show that these can be organized in a natural way as a symmetric monoidal category, albeit one that is not compact closed. We then construct a related category **InvQM** of embedded euclidean Jordan algebras, having fewer objects but more morphisms, that is not only compact closed but dagger-compact. This category unifies finite-dimensional real, complex and quaternionic mixed-state quantum mechanics, except that the composite of two complex quantum systems comes with an extra classical bit.

Our notion of composite requires neither tomographic locality, nor preservation of purity under tensor product. The categories we construct include examples in which both of these conditions fail. In such cases, the information capacity (the maximum number of mutually distinguishable states) of a composite is greater than the product of the capacities of its constituents.

[*]Riemann Center for Geometry and Physics, Institute for Theoretical Physics, Leibniz Universität Hannover

[†]University of New Mexico, hnbarnum@aol.com

[‡]Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Waterloo

[§]Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo

[¶]Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, mgraydon@perimeterinstitute.ca

[‖]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Susquehanna University wilce@susqu.edu

# 1 Introduction

Formally real Jordan algebras were first proposed as models of quantum systems by P. Jordan in 1933 [27]. Abstractly, a Jordan algebra is a real vector space $A$ equipped with a commutative bilinear product $\bullet$ satisfying the *Jordan identity* $a^2 \bullet (a \bullet b) = a \bullet (a^2 \bullet b)$ for all $a, b \in A$ (where $a^2 = a \bullet a$). We also assume that $A$ has a unit element, which we denote by $u$. $A$ is *formally real* if, for $a_1, ..., a_n \in A$, $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 = 0$ only when $a_i = 0$ for all $i$. If $A$ is finite-dimensional, this is equivalent to $A$'s being *euclidean*, meaning that it carries an inner product such that $\langle a \bullet b | c \rangle = \langle a | b \bullet c \rangle$ for all $a, b, c \in A$.

The standard example is the set $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H})$ of self-adjoint operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbf{H}$, with $a \bullet b = (ab + ba)/2$, and with $\langle a | b \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(ab)$. In 1934, Jordan, von Neumann and Wigner [28] showed that all finite-dimensional formally real — equivalently, euclidean — Jordan algebras are direct sums of irreducible, or *simple*, such algebras, and that the latter are of just five kinds: self-adjoint parts of real, complex or quaternionic matrix algebras (which we can regard as real, complex or quaternionic quantum systems) *spin factors* (which are analogues of qubits in which the "Bloch sphere" can have arbitrary finite dimension), and the *exceptional Jordan algebra* of $3 \times 3$ self-adjoint octonionic matrices.

A reasonable objection is that the physical meaning of the Jordan product is obscure. (Indeed, it is not obvious why the observables of a physical system should carry any physically meaningful bilinear product at all.) Happily, there are alternative characterizations of euclidean Jordan algebras in terms of ordered vector spaces and related concepts having readier physical, probabilistic, or operational interpretations. The Koecher-Vinberg Theorem ([29, 39]; see also [30], [18], Chapter III or [35], Chapter I, §8) identifies euclidean Jordan algebras with finite-dimensional ordered vector spaces having homogeneous, self-dual cones; work of Alfsen and Shultz [4, 3] characterizes EJAs in terms of certain projections associated with closed faces of the positive cone.[1] Exploiting these results, several recent papers [11, 34, 41, 42, 40] have shown that physically reasonable postulates force a finite-dimensional physical system to have the structure of a euclidean Jordan algebra. To this extent, euclidean Jordan algebras are a natural class of models for physical systems.

A physical theory, however, is more than a collection of models of physical systems. It must also describe how systems change and how they interact. It is natural, therefore, to represent a physical theory as a *category*, in which objects represent physical systems and morphisms represent physical processes. To accommodate composite systems, one wants the category to be monoidal, i.e., to be equipped with an associative "tensor product". This point of view has been developed very fruitfully in [1, 7] and elsewhere, where it is shown that many features of finite-dimensional quantum mechanics can be recovered if the category in question is compact closed, or, better still, dagger-compact (terms we explain in Section 5).

[1] Alfsen and Shultz' results apply, more generally, to JB-algebras, which in the context of finite dimension are the formally real Jordan algebras.

In this paper, building on work of Hanche-Olsen [21] and Jamjoom [26] on tensor products of JC-algebras, we classify the possible non-signaling composites of euclidean Jordan-algebraic systems, subject to a few reasonable constraints. In particular, we show that no such composite exists if either factor is exceptional, and that a composite is always a special Jordan algebra, and, indeed, a direct summand of the universal tensor product defined by Hanche-Olsen.

Restricting attention further to Jordan algebras corresponding to real, complex and quaternionic quantum systems, we then identify two different monoidal subcategories extending the category of finite-dimensional complex matrix algebras and CP maps. One of these, which we call **RSE**, unifies real, complex and quaternionic quantum mechanics, but lacks certain desirable features. In particular, in this category, *states* are not represented by morphisms; hence, the category is far from being compact closed. The other category, which *is* compact closed, also embraces real, complex and quaternionic quantum systems and processes (CP maps), *except* that its rule for composing standard complex quantum systems yields an extra classical bit.

These results, combined with the those of (any of) the papers cited above, in which a euclidean Jordan structure emerges from information-theoretically, physically or operationally natural assumptions, lend support to the idea of unified quantum theory that embraces real, complex and quaternionic quantum systems, and permits the formation of composites of these. Consistent with the results of [13], the composites that arise in these constructions do not in general have the property of "tomographic locality": states on the composite of two Jordan-algebraic systems are not, in general, determined by the joint probabilities they assign to measurement outcomes associated with the two component systems. Equivalently, the Jordan algebra $AB$ corresponding to a composite of two formally real Jordan algebraic systems $A$ and $B$, will generally be larger than the algebraic (i.e., vector-space) tensor product $A \otimes B$.

*Remark:* A related proposal is advanced by Baez [8], who points out that one can regard real and quaternionic quantum systems as pairs $(\mathbf{H}, J)$, where $\mathbf{H}$ is a complex Hilbert space and $J$ is an anti-unitary satisfying $J^2 = \mathbf{1}$ (the real case) or $J^2 = -\mathbf{1}$ (the quaternionic case). Such pairs can be organized into a dagger-compact symmetric monoidal category, with morphisms $(\mathbf{H}_1, J_1) \to (\mathbf{H}_2, J_2)$ linear mappings intertwining $J_1$ and $J_2$, and $(\mathbf{H}_1, J_1) \otimes (\mathbf{H}_2, J_2) = (\mathbf{H}_1 \otimes \mathbf{H}_2, J_1 \otimes J_2)$. This provides a unification of real and quaternionic quantum mechanics at the level of pure states and linear mappings between the relevant Hilbert spaces, where our approach takes in quantum systems over all three of the division rings $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{H}$, at the level of mixed states, observables and completely positive maps. While the precise connection between Baez' approach and ours is still under study, it seems to us likely that an application of Selingers CPM construction [36] to Baez' category will yield a category of the type we consider here.

Our results rest on a mixture of standard facts about ordered vector spaces, the order structure and the representation theory of euclidean Jordan algebras, and the pioneering work of Hanche-Olsen [21] on universal representations and tensor products

of JC-algebras. Since much of this will be unfamiliar to many readers, we have included a good amount of purely expository material. Section 2 provides background on order unit spaces and their interpretation as general probabilistic models, including a fairly general notion of composite for such model. (This material will be more familiar to many readers, but some of our notation and terminology, and some notions specific to our present purposes, may not be.) Section 3 collects background material on euclidean Jordan algebras, their universal representations, and Hanche-Olsen's universal tensor product.

The balance of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 4, we introduce a general definition for the composite of two euclidean Jordan-algebraic probabilistic models, and establish some basic properties of any such composite. Along the way, we see that the composite of two simple EJAs must be embeddable in a complex matrix algebra, i.e. it must be *special* (Theorem 4.9). From this it follows that no simple EJA has any composite with an exceptional EJA (Corollary 4.10), and that if $A$ and $B$ are simple EJAs, then any composite of $A$ and $B$ must be an ideal — that is, a direct summand — in their universal tensor product (Corollary 4.11).

These results warrant our focusing on special EJAs. Section 5 develops a canonical, and naturally associative, tensor product of embedded EJAs, that is, pairs $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ where $\mathbf{M}_A$ is a finite-dimensional complex $*$-algebra and $A$ is a Jordan subalgebra of the self-adjoint part of $\mathbf{M}_A$. (The universal tensor product is the special case in which $\mathbf{M}_A$ and $\mathbf{M}_B$ are the universal complex enveloping algebras of $A$ and $B$.) In Section 6 we introduce a class of mappings we call *completely Jordan-preserving* and use these to construct symmetric monoidal categories of embedded EJAs, some of which we then show are compact closed or, indeed, dagger-compact. Section 7 concludes with further discussion of these categories and their physical and information-processing significance. To avoid obstructing the flow of the main arguments, we have removed some technical details to a series of appendices.

**Acknowledgments** Some of our results have previously been announced, without proof, in [10].[2] HB and AW wish to thank C. M. Edwards for introducing them to the paper [21] of Hanche-Olsen. HB and MG thank Cozmin Ududec for valuable discussions. AW is supported by a grant from the FQXi foundation (FQXi-RFP3-1348). This research was supported in part by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

[2]There, it is erroneously claimed that **RSE** is compact closed. This error is corrected in Section 6 of the present paper; see especially Examples 6.3 and 6.11

# 2 Ordered vector spaces and probabilistic models

In this section and the next, we present enough background material to make this paper reasonably self-contained. This section summarizes basic information about ordered vector spaces and the "convex operational" (or "generalized probabilistic theories") framework for discussing probabilistic physical theories. A good general reference for ordered vector spaces is Chapter 1 of [2] (or the summary in Appendix A of [3]). The use of ordered vector spaces with order units as probabilistic models goes back at least to the work of Ludwig [32, 31]; see also [16, 17, 24]. For a more recent survey, see [14].

## 2.1 Ordered vector spaces

Let $A$ be a real vector space. A (convex, pointed) *cone* in $A$ is a convex set $K \subseteq A$ such that $a \in K$ implies $ta \in K$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $K \cap -K = \{0\}$. A cone $K$ is *generating* iff it spans $A$, i.e., if every $a \in A$ can be expressed as a difference of elements of $K$. Any cone (generating or not) induces a partial ordering of $A$, given by $a \leq b$ iff $b - a \in K$; this is translation-invariant, i.e, $a \leq b$ implies $a + c \leq b + c$ for all $a, b, c \in A$, and homogeneous, i.e., $a \leq b$ implies $ta \leq tb$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Conversely, such an ordering determines a cone, namely $K = \{a | a \geq 0\}$. Accordingly, an *ordered vector space* is a real vector space $A$ equipped with a designated *positive cone* cone $A_+$. It is common to assume, and we shall assume here, that $A_+$ is closed and generating. *We also assume, without further comment, that all ordered vector spaces are finite dimensional.*

If $A$ and $B$ are ordered vector spaces, a linear mapping $f : A \to B$ is *positive* iff $f(A_+) \subseteq B_+$. If $f$ is bijective and $f(A_+) = B_+$, then $f^{-1}(B_+) = A_+$, so that $f^{-1}$ is also positive. In this case, we say that $f$ is an *order isomorphism*. An *order automorphism* of $A$ is an order isomorphism from $A$ to itself.

Denoting the dual space of $A$ by $A^*$, the *dual cone*, $A^*_+$, is the set of positive linear functionals on $A$. Since we are assuming that $A_+$ is generating, it is easy to see that $A^*_+ \cap -A^*_+ = \{0\}$. In our finite-dimensional setting, $A^*_+$ is also generating. Note that if $B$ is another ordered vector space and $\phi : A \to B$ is a positive linear mapping, then the dual mapping $\phi^* : B^* \to A^*$ is also positive.

## 2.2 Order units and probabilistic models

An *order unit* in an ordered vector space $A$ is an element $u \in A_+$ such that, for all $a \in A$, $a \leq tu$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In finite dimensions, this is equivalent to $u$ belonging to the interior of $A_+$ (cf. [5], Theorem 2.8). An *order unit space* is a pair $(A, u)$ where $A$ is an ordered vector space and $u$ is a designated order unit.

An order unit space provides the machinery to discuss probabilistic concepts. A *state* on $(A, u)$ is a positive linear functional $\alpha \in A^*$ with $\alpha(u) = 1$. An *effect* is an element $a \in A_+$ with $a \leq u$. If $\alpha$ is a state and $a$ is an effect, we have $0 \leq \alpha(a) \leq 1$: we interpret this as the *probability* of the given effect on the given state. A *discrete*

*observable* on $A$ with values $\lambda \in \Lambda$ is represented by an indexed family $\{a_\lambda | \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ of effects summing to $u$, the effect $a_\lambda$ representing the event of obtaining value $\lambda$ in a measurement of the observable. Thus, if $\alpha$ is a state, $\lambda \mapsto \alpha(a_\lambda)$ gives a probability weight on $\Lambda$. (One can extend this discussion to include more general observables by considering effect-valued measures (cf. [17]), but we will not need this extra generality here.)

We denote the set of all states of $A$ by $\Omega$; the set of all effects — the interval between 0 and $u$ — is denoted $[0, u]$. In our present finite-dimensional setting, both are compact convex sets. Extreme points of $\Omega$ are called *pure states*.

**Examples**

(1) *Discrete Classical Probability Theory:* If $S$ is a finite set, regarded as the outcome space of some classical experiment, let $A(S) = \mathbb{R}^S$, ordered pointwise. Elements of $A(S)_+$ are then non-negative random variables, and effects are random variables with values between 0 and 1. We turn this into an order unit space by taking $u \in A(S)_+$ to be the constant function with value 1. It is then easy to show that normalized states on $A(S)$ correspond exactly to probability weights on $S$; discrete observables correspond in a natural way to discrete "fuzzy" random variables. Extreme effects, i.e, extreme points of $[0, u]$, are easily seen to be characteristic functions of subsets of $S$; hence, an observable $\{a_\lambda\}$ with $a_\lambda$ extreme for each $\lambda$, corresponds to an ordinary "sharp" random variable.

(2) *Discrete Quantum Probability Theory:* If $\mathbf{H}$ is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, let $A(\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H})$, the space of self-adjoint operators on $\mathbf{H}$, ordered by the cone of positive semidefinite operators; let $u = \mathbf{1}$, the identity operator on $\mathbf{H}$. Then each normalized state $\alpha$ has the form $\alpha(a) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho a)$ where $\rho$ is a density operator, and, conversely, every density operator determines in this way a normalized state,. Observables correspond to discrete POVMs; thus, we recover orthodox finite-dimensional quantum probability theory.

(3) A class of examples that embraces both (1) and (2) is the following. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a unital complex $*$-algebra; define $\mathbf{M}_+$ to consist of all $a \in \mathbf{M}$ with $a = b^*b$ for some $b \in \mathbf{M}$: then $(\mathbf{M}_{sa}, \mathbf{M}_+)$ is an ordered vector space, in which the unit element of $\mathbf{M}$ serves as an order unit. If $\mathbf{M}$ is finite-dimensional and commutative, one essentially recovers example (1); if $\mathbf{M}$ is the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $n \times n$ complex matrices, one essentially recovers example (2). More generally, if $\mathbf{M}$ is finite-dimensional, Wedderburn's theorem tells us that $\mathbf{M}$ is a direct sum of matrix algebras, so one has finite-dimensional quantum theory with superselection rules (classical discrete probability theory being the special case in which all superselection sectors — that is, direct summands — are one-dimensional).

One may wish to privilege certain states and/or certain effects of a probabilistic model as being "physically possible". One way of doing so is to consider ordered subspaces $E$ of $A$, with $u_A \in E$, and $V$ of $A^*$: this picks out the set of states $\alpha \in V \cap A_+$ and the set of effects $a \in E \cap A_+$, $a \leq u$. The pair $(E, V)$ then serves as a probabilis-

tic model for a system having these allowed states and effects. However, in the three examples above, and in those that concern us in the rest of this paper, it is always possible to regard *all* states in $A^*$, and *all* effects in $A$, as allowed. Henceforth, then, when we speak of a *probabilistic model* — or, more briefly, a *model* — we simply mean an order unit space $(A, u)$. It will be convenient to adopt the shorthand $A$ for such a pair, writing $u_A$ for the order unit where necessary.

**Processes, Symmetries and Dynamics** By a *process* affecting a system represented by a probabilistic model $A$, we mean a positive linear mapping $\phi : A \to A$, subject to the condition that $\phi(u_A) \leq u_A$. The probability of observing an effect $a$ after the system has been prepared in a state $\alpha$ and then subjected to a process $\phi$ is $\alpha(\phi(a))$. One can regard $\alpha(\phi(u))$ as the probability that the system is not destroyed by the process. We can, of course, replace $\phi : A \to A$ with the adjoint mapping $\phi^* : A^* \to A^*$ given by $\phi^*(\alpha) = \alpha \circ \phi$, so as to think of a process as a mapping from states to possibly sub-normalized states. Thus, we can view processes either as acting on effects (the "Heisenberg picture"), or on states (the "Schrödinger picture").

Any non-zero positive linear mapping $\phi : A \to A$ is a non-negative scalar multiple of a process in the above sense: since $\Omega(A)$ is compact, $\{\alpha(\phi(u))|\alpha \in \Omega(A)\}$ is a compact set of real numbers, not all zero, and so, has a maximum value $m(\phi) > 0$; $m(\phi)^{-1}\phi$ is then a process. For this reason, we make little further distinction here between processes and positive mappings. In particular, if $\phi$ is an order automorphism of $A$, then both $\phi$ and $\phi^{-1}$ are scalar multiples of processes in the above sense: each of these processes "undoes" the other, *up to normalization*, i.e., with nonzero probability. A process that can be reversed with probability one is represented by an order-automorphism $\phi$ such that $\phi(u_A) = u_A$, in which case $\phi^*$ takes normalized states to normalized states. Such an order-automorphism is called a *symmetry* of $A$.

We denote the group of all order-automorphisms of $A$ by $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$. [3] This is a Lie group (see e.g. [25], pp. 182-183); its connected identity component (consisting of those processes that can be obtained by continuously deforming the identity map) is denoted $\mathrm{Aut}_0(A)$. A possible (probabilistically) reversible *dynamics* for a system modelled by $A$ is a homomorphism $t \mapsto \phi_t$ from $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ to $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$, i.e., a one-parameter subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$. The set of symmetries forms a compact subgroup, $\mathrm{Sym}(A)$, of $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$.

One might wish to privilege certain processes as reflecting physically possible motions or evolutions of the system. In that case, one might add to the basic data $(A, u)$ a preferred subgroup $G(A)$ of order automorphisms. We refer to such a structure as a *dynamical* probabilistic model, since the choice of $G(A)$ constrains the permitted probabilistically reversible dynamics of the model.

**Self-Duality** An inner product $\langle \ | \ \rangle$ on an ordered vector space $A$ is *positive* iff the associated mapping $A \to A^*$, $a \mapsto \langle a|$, is positive, i.e,. if $\langle a, b\rangle \geq 0$ for all $a, b \in A_+$.

[3] Here our usage diverges from that of [3] and [18], who use $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$ to denote the group of Jordan automorphisms of a Jordan algebra $A$.

We say that $\langle \ | \ \rangle$ is *self-dualizing* if $a \mapsto \langle a|$ maps $A_+$ *onto* $A_+^*$, so that $a \in A_+$ if and only if $\langle a, b\rangle \geq 0$ for all $b \in B$. We say that $A$ (or its positive cone) is *self-dual* if $A$ admits a self-dualizing inner product. If $A$ is an order unit space, we ordinarily normalize such an inner product so that $\langle u_A, u_A\rangle = 1$. In this case, we can represent states of $A$ *internally*: if $\alpha \in A_+^*$ with $\alpha(u) = 1$, there is a unique $a \in A_+$ with $\langle a, b\rangle = \alpha(b)$ for all $b \in A_+$. Conversely, if $a \in A_+$ with $\langle a, u\rangle = 1$, then $\langle a|$ is a state.

The probabilistic models associated with classical and quantum systems, as discussed above, are self-dual. Indeed, in non-relativistic quantum theory, where $A = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H})$, the standard trace inner product $\langle a, b\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(ab)$ is self-dualizing. Here it is *usual* to identify states internally, i.e., as density operators.

If $A$ and $B$ are both self-dual and $\phi : A \to B$ is a positive linear mapping, we can use self-dualizing inner products on $A$ and $B$ to represent the mapping $\phi^* : B^* \to A^*$ as a positive linear mapping $\phi^\dagger : B \to A$, setting $\langle a, \phi^\dagger(b)\rangle = \langle \phi(a), b\rangle$ for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. If $\phi : A \to A$ is an order-automorphism, then so is $\phi^\dagger$.

## 2.3 Composites of probabilistic models

If $A$ and $B$ are probabilistic models of two physical systems, one may want to construct a model of the pair of systems considered together. In quantum mechanics, where $A = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}_1)$ and $B = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}_2)$, one would form the model $AB = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}_1 \otimes \mathbf{H}_2)$ associated with the tensor product of the two Hilbert spaces. In the framework of general probabilistic models, there is no such canonical choice for a model of a composite system. However, one can at least say what one *means* by a composite of two probabilistic models: at a minimum, one should be able to perform measurements on the two systems separately, and compare the results. More formally, there should be a mapping $\pi : A \times B \to AB$ taking each pair of effects $(a, b) \in A \times B$ to an effect $\pi(a, b) \in AB$. One would like this to be *non-signaling*, meaning that the probability of obtaining a particular effect on one of the component systems in a state $\omega \in \Omega(AB)$ should be independent of what observable is measured on the other system. One can show that this is equivalent to $\pi$'s being bilinear, with $\pi(u_A, u_B) = u_{AB}$. [14]. Finally, one would like to be able to prepare $A$ and $B$ separately in arbitrary states. Summarizing:

**Definition 2.1.** A (non-signaling) *composite* of probabilistic models $A$ and $B$, is a pair $(AB, \pi)$ where $AB$ is a probabilistic model, and $\pi : A \times B \to AB$ is a bilinear mapping such that

(a) $\pi(a, b) \in (AB)_+$ for all $a \in A_+$ and $b \in B_+$;

(b) $\pi(u_A, u_B) = u_{AB}$;

(c) For every pair of states $\alpha \in \Omega(A)$ and $\beta \in \Omega(B)$, there exists a state $\gamma$ in $\Omega(AB)$ such that $\gamma(\pi(a, b)) = \alpha(a)\beta(b)$.

Since $\pi$ is bilinear, it extends uniquely to a linear mapping $A \otimes B \to AB$, which we continue to denote by $\pi$ (so that $\pi(a \otimes b) = \pi(a, b)$ for $a \in A, b \in B$).

**Lemma 2.2.** *$\pi$ is injective.*

*Proof:* If $\pi(T) = 0$ for some $T \in A \otimes B$, then for all states $\alpha, \beta$ on $A$ and $B$, we have a state $\gamma$ on $AB$ with $(\alpha \otimes \beta)(T) = \gamma(\pi(T)) = 0$. But then $T = 0$. $\square$

This warrants our treating $A \otimes B$ as a subspace of $AB$ and writing $a \otimes b$ for $\pi(a, b)$. Note that if $\omega$ is a state on $AB$, then $\pi^*(\omega) := \omega \circ \pi$ defines a joint probability assignment on effects of $A$ and $B$:

$$\pi^*(\omega)(a, b) = \omega(a \otimes b).$$

This gives us marginal states $\omega_A = \omega(u_A \otimes -)$ and $\omega_B = \omega(- \otimes u_B)$. Where these are non-zero, we can also define conditional states $\omega_{1|b}(a) := \omega(a \otimes b)/\omega_B(b)$ and $\omega_{2|a}(b) = \omega(a \otimes b)/\omega_A(a)$.[4]

When the mapping $\pi : A \otimes B \to AB$ is surjective, we can identify $AB$ with $A \otimes B$. The joint probability assigment $\pi^*(\omega)$ then completely determines $\omega$, so that states on $AB$ *are* such joint probability assignments. In this case, we say that $AB$ is *locally tomographic*, since states of $AB$ can be determined by comparing the results of "local" measurements, i.e., measurements carried out on $A$ and $B$ alone. In finite dimensions, both classical and *complex* quantum-mechanical composites have this feature, while composites of real quantum systems are not locally tomographic [6, 23].

When dealing with dynamical probabilistic models, one needs to supplement conditions (a), (b) and (c) with the further condition that it should be possible for $A$ and $B$ to evolve independently within the composite $AB$. That is:

**Definition 2.3.** A composite of dynamical probabilistic models $A$ and $B$ is a composite $AB$, in the sense of Definition 2.1, plus a mapping $\otimes : G(A) \times G(B) \to G(AB)$ selecting, for each $g \in G(A)$ and $h \in G(B)$, an element $g \otimes h \in G(AB)$, such that

(a) $(g \otimes h)(a \otimes b) = ga \otimes hb$ for all $g \in G(A)$, $h \in G(B)$, $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, and

(b) for $g_1, g_2 \in G(A)$ and $h_1, h_2 \in G(B)$,

$$(g_1 \circ g_2) \otimes (h_1 \circ h_2) = (g_1 \otimes h_1) \circ (g_2 \otimes h_2).$$

(Note that since $AB$ may be larger than the algebraic tensor product $A \otimes B$, the symmetry $(g \otimes h)$ need not be uniquely determined by condition (a).)

## 2.4 Probabilistic theories as categories

A physical theory is more than a collection of models. At a minimum, one also needs the means to describe interactions between physical systems. A natural way of

[4] In the context of a more general definition of probabilistic models, in which the cone generated by allowed states might not be the full dual cone $A_+^*$, we would need to modify this definition to enforce that these conditional states belong to the allowed state-space. See [14] for details.

accomplishing this is to treat physical theories as *categories*, in which objects represent physical systems, and morphisms represent processes. In the setting of this paper, then, it's natural to regard a probabilistic *theory* as a category $\mathcal{C}$ in which objects are probabilistic models, i.e., order unit spaces, and in which morphisms give rise to positive linear mappings between these.

The reason for this phrasing — morphisms *giving rise to*, as opposed to simply *being*, positive linear mappings — is to allow for the possibility that two abstract processes that behave the same way on effects of their source system, may differ in other ways—even in detectable ways, such as their effect on composite systems of which the source and target systems are components. If distinct morphisms between the same two objects always induce the same positive map, we say the category, and the set of morphisms, *has local process tomography*[5]. Notice that invertible morphisms $A \to A$ that preserve the order unit then induce processes in the sense given above, so that every model $A \in \mathcal{C}$ carries a distinguished group of reversible processes: models in $\mathcal{C}$, in other words, are automatically *dynamical* models.

In order to allow for the formation of composite systems, it is natural to ask that $\mathcal{C}$ be a symmetric monoidal category. That is, we wish to equip $\mathcal{C}$ with a bifunctorial product $\otimes : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ that is naturally associative and commutative, and for which there is a unit object $I$ with $I \otimes A \simeq A \simeq A \otimes I$ for objects $A \in \mathcal{C}$. Of course, we want to take $I = \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for objects $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, we want $A \otimes B$ to be a composite in the sense of Definitions 2.1 and 2.3 above. In fact, though, every part of those definitions simply *follows from* the monoidality of $\mathcal{C}$, except for part (b) of 2.1; we must add "by hand" the requirement that $u_A \otimes u_B = u_{A \otimes B}$. The category will also pick out, for each object $A$, a preferred group $G(A)$, namely, the group of invertible morphisms in $\mathcal{C}(A, A)$. The monoidal structure then picks out, for $g \in g(A)$ and $h \in G(B)$, a preferred $g \otimes h \in G(AB)$.

# 3 Background on Euclidean Jordan algebras

In this section, we summarize the essential background information on euclidean Jordan algebras and their universal tensor products that will be used in the sequel. General references for this material are the monographs [3] of Alfsen and Shultz and [18] of Faraut and Koranyi and [22] of Hanche-Olsen and Størmer, plus the paper [21] of Hanche-Olsen.

[5] One way to make this more precise is to require that $\mathcal{C}$ contain $\mathbb{R}$, ordered as usual and with order unit 1, and that $\mathcal{C}(I, A)$ *be* the cone of positive linear maps $\mathbb{R} \to A$, so that $\mathcal{C}(I, A) \simeq A_+$. Any morphism $\phi \in \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ then gives rise to a mapping $\widehat{\phi} : \mathcal{C}(I, A) \to \mathcal{C}(I, B)$ by $\widehat{\phi}(a) = \phi \circ a$ for every $a \in \mathcal{C}(I, A)$; this extends to a positive linear mapping $A \to B$. We shall not pursue this further here; see [12] for more on these lines.

## 3.1 Euclidean Jordan algebras

As already mentioned, a *euclidean Jordan algebra* (hereafter: EJA) is a finite-dimensional commutative (but not necessarily associative) real algebra $(A, \bullet)$ with a multiplicative unit element $u$, satisfying the *Jordan identity* $a^2 \bullet (a \bullet b) = a \bullet (a^2 \bullet b)$ for all $a, b \in A$, and equipped with an inner product satisfying $\langle a \bullet b, c\rangle = \langle b, a \bullet c\rangle$ for all $a, b, c \in A$. Obviously, any commutative, associative real algebra provides an example, but not an interesting one. The basic interesting example is the self-adjoint part of a complex matrix algebra $M$, with $a \bullet b = (ab + ba)/2$ and with $\langle a, b\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(ab)$. Any Jordan subalgebra of an EJA is also an EJA. Since real and quaternionic matrix algebras have representations as subalgebras of complex matrix algebras, their self-adjoint parts are again EJAs. So, too, is the *spin factor* $V_n = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, with the obvious inner product and with

$$(t, x) \bullet (s, y) = (ts + \langle x, y\rangle, ty + sx);$$

this can be embedded in $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ if $n = 2k$ or $2k + 1$, as discussed in more detail in Appendix C

**Classification** Direct sums of EJAs are also EJAs, so we can obtain more examples by forming direct sums of the EJAs of the types mentioned above. The *Jordan-von Neumann-Wigner Classification Theorem* [28] provides a near converse: every euclidean Jordan algebra is a direct sum of *simple* EJAs, each of which is isomorphic to a spin factor $V_n$, or to the self-adjoint part of a matrix algebra $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ where $\mathbb{F}$ is one of the classical division rings $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$, *or*, if $n = 3$, the *octonions*, $\mathbb{O}$. This last example, which is not embeddable into a complex matrix algebra, is called the *exceptional Jordan algebra*, or the *Albert algebra*.

A Jordan algebra that *is* embeddable in the self-adjoint part of a complex matrix algebra is said to be *special*. In addition to $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$, the simple EJAs $M_n(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$, $M_n(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$ and $V_n$ are all special. It follows from the classification theorem that any EJA decomposes as a direct sum $A_{sp} \oplus A_{ex}$ where $A_{sp}$ is special and $A_{ex}$ is a direct sum of copies of the exceptional Jordan algebra.

**Operator commutation** For each $a \in A$, define $L_a : A \to A$ to be the operation of Jordan-multiplication by $a$: $L_a(x) = a \bullet x$ for all $x \in A$. Elements $a, b \in A$ are said to *operator commute* iff $L_a \circ L_b = L_b \circ L_a$. If $A$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $M_{sa}$, where $M$ is a complex $*$-algebra, then for all $x \in A$,

$$4L_a(L_b x) = a(bx + xb) + (bx + xb)a = abx + axb + bxa + xba$$

and similarly

$$4L_b(L_a x) = bax + bxa + axb + xab.$$

If $a$ and $b$ operator-commute, the left-hand sides are equal. Subtracting, we have

$$abx + xba - bax - xab = 0$$

or

$$[a,b]x + x[b,a] = 0$$

which is to say, $[a,b]x - x[a,b] = 0$. If $M$ is unital and $A$ is a unital subalgebra, so that $u_A = 1_{\mathbf{M}}$, then setting $x = 1_M \in A$ gives us $[a,b] = -[a,b]$, i.e., $a$ and $b$ commute in $M$.

**Projections and the Spectral Theorem** A *projection* in an EJA $A$ is an element $a \in A$ with $a^2 = a$. If $p, q$ are projections with $p \bullet q = 0$, we say that $p$ and $q$ are orthogonal. In this case, $p+q$ is another projection. A projection not representable as a sum of other projections is said to be *minimal* or *primitive*. A *Jordan frame* is a set $E \subseteq A$ of pairwise orthogonal minimal projections that sum to the Jordan unit. The *Spectral Theorem* for EJAs (see e.g. [18], Theorem III.1.1, or [3], Theorem 2.20 for an infinite-dimensional version) asserts that every element $a \in A$ can be expanded as a linear combination $a = \sum_{x \in E} t_x x$ where $E$ is some Jordan frame and $t_x$ is a coefficient in $\mathbb{R}$ for each $x \in E$.

The group of Jordan automorphisms acts transitively on the set of Jordan frames ([18], Theorem IV.2.5). Hence all Jordan frames for a given euclidean Jordan algebra $A$ have the same number of elements. This number is called the *rank* of $A$. By the Classification Theorem, all simple Jordan algebras having rank 4 or higher are special.

## 3.2 Euclidean Jordan algebras as ordered vector spaces

Any euclidean Jordan algebra $A$ can be regarded as an ordered real vector space, with positive cone $A_+ = \{a^2 | a \in A\}$. (That this *is* a cone is a non-trivial fact (see [18], Theorem III.2.1, or [2], pp. 36-28). By the spectral theorem, $a = b^2$ for some $b \in A$ iff $a$ has a spectral decomposition $a = \sum_i \lambda_i x_i$ in which all the coefficients $\lambda_i$ are non-negative.

The Jordan unit $u$ is also an order unit; thus, any EJA can serve as a probabilistic model, as defined in Section 2: physical states correspond to states *qua* normalized positive linear functionals on $A$, while measurement outcomes are represented by *effects*, i.e, elements $a \in A_+$ with $0 \leq a \leq u$, and (discrete) observables, by sets $\{e_i\}$ of events with $\sum_i e_i = u$.

As discussed earlier, the inner product on $A$ allows us to represent states internally, i.e., for every state $\alpha$ there exists a unique $a \in A_+$ with $\alpha(x) = \langle a|x\rangle$ for all $x \in A$; conversely, every vector $a \in A_+$ with $\langle a|u\rangle = 1$ defines a state in this way. Now, if $a$ is a projection, i.e., $a^2 = a$, let $\widehat{a} = \|a\|^{-1}a$: then

$$\langle \widehat{a}|u\rangle = \frac{1}{\|a\|^2}\langle a|u\rangle = \frac{1}{\|a\|^2}\langle a^2|u\rangle = \frac{1}{\|a\|^2}\langle a|a\rangle = 1.$$

Thus, $\widehat{a}$ represents a state. A similar computation shows that $\langle \widehat{a}|a\rangle = 1$. Thus, every projection, regarded as an effect, has probability 1 in some state. The following is the converse:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $A$ be an EJA, and let $a \in A_+$ with $a \leq u$. If there exists a state $\alpha$ on $A$ with $\alpha(a) = 1$, then $a$ is a projection.*

*Proof:* By the Spectral Theorem and the fact that $0 \leq a$, $a = \sum_{x \in E} t_x x$ for some Jordan frame $E$ and coefficients $t_x \geq 0$, $x \in E$. Since $a \leq u$, for any fixed $x_o \in E$ we have $t_{x_o} = \langle x_o, a \rangle \leq \langle x_o, u \rangle = 1$. Now suppose there is a state $\alpha$ with $\alpha(a) = 1$. Then we have $\sum_{x \in E} t_x \alpha(x) = 1$. Since $\sum_{x \in E} \alpha(x) = \alpha(u) = 1$, it follows that 1 is a convex combination of the coefficients $\{t_x\}$, each of which lies between 0 and 1. Hence, $t_x = 1$ or $t_x = 0$ for every $x \in E$, whence, $a = \sum_{x \in A} x$ for a set $A \subseteq E$. Since the elements of $A$ are pairwise orthogonal projections, $a$ is also a projection. $\square$

A *sharp* observable is one in which every outcome has probability one in some state. The preceding Lemma tells us that these are the same as projection-valued observables. A maximally fine-grained sharp observable is therefore a collection $\{p_i\}$ of *minimal* non-zero projections summing to the unit $u$, i.e., a Jordan frame.

**Order-automorphisms** The order structure of an EJA $A$, together with its inner product an order unit, entirely determines its Jordan structure. One manifestation of this is that a symmetry of $A$ — that is, an order-automorphism preserving the unit $u_A$ — is the same thing as a Jordan automorphism ([3], Theorem 2.80).

Another class of order automorphisms is given by the *quadratic representations* of certain elements of $A$. The quadratic representation of $a \in A$ is the mapping $U_a : A \to A$ given by

$$U_a = 2L_a^2 - L_{a^2}$$

i.e., $U_a(x) = 2a(ax) - a^2(x)$. These mappings have direct physical interpretations as *filters* in the sense of [40]. The following non-trivial facts will be used repeatedly in what follows:

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let $a \in A$. Then*

*(a) $U_a$ is a positive mapping;*

*(b) If $a$ lies in the interior of $A_+$, $U_a$ is invertible, with inverse given by $U_{a^{-1}}$;*

*(c) $e^{L_a} = U_{e^{a/2}}$*

*Proof:* For (a), see Theorem 1.25 of [3]; for (b), [3] Lemma 1.23 or [18], Proposition II.3.1. Part (c) is Proposition II.3.4 in [18]. $\square$

Combining (a) and (b), $U_a$ is an order automorphism for every $a$ in the interior of $A_+$. Regarding (c), note that $e^{L_a}$ is the ordinary operator exponential; in other words, $\phi_t := e^{tL_a} = U_{\frac{t}{2}a}$ is a one-parameter group of order-automorphisms in $G(A)$ with $\phi'(0) = L_a$.

Since $U_a(u_A) = 2a^2 - a^2 = a^2$, it follows that the group of order-automorphisms of $A$ act transitively on the interior of $A_+$. Abstractly, an ordered vector space

having this property is said to be *homogeneous*. It follows that if $\phi$ is any order-automorphism with $\phi(u_A) = a^2 \in A_+$, then $U_a^{-1} \circ \phi$ is a symmetry of $A$. Hence, every order-automorphism of $A$ decomposes as $\phi = U_a \circ g$ where $g$ is a symmetry. In fact, one can show that $a$ can be chosen to belong to the interior of $A_+$, and that, with this choice, the decomposition is unique ([18], III.5.1)

**Self-Duality and the KV Theorem** The inner product on an EJA $A$ is self-dualizing. Recall that this means that an element $a \in A$ belongs to the cone $A_+$ iff $\langle a|b\rangle \geq 0$ for all elements $b$ of $A_+$ — equivalently, iff $\langle a|$ belongs to the dual cone $A_+^*$. Thus, as an ordered vector space, $A$ is both self-dual and homogeneous. Conversely, if $(A, u)$ is an homogenous finite-dimensional order unit space with a self-dualizing inner product, there exists a *unique* bilinear product on $A$ making $A$, with the given inner product, a euclidean Jordan algebra, and the order unit, the Jordan unit. This is the content of the *Koecher-Vinberg Theorem*. While we make no use of this result here, it is at the center of efforts to provide an operational motivation for euclidean Jordan algebras as models of physical systems, e.g., in [40, 11].

## 3.3 Representations of EJAs

A *representation* of a Jordan algebra $A$ is a Jordan homomorphism $\pi : A \to M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ for some $n$.[6] So a Jordan algebra is special iff it has an injective, or *faithful*, representation. Recall that every EJA decomposes as a direct sum $A = A_{sp} \oplus A_{ex}$, where $A_{sp}$ is special and $A_{ex}$ has no non-trivial representations. The latter, in turn, is a direct sum of copies of the exceptional EJA $M_3(\mathbb{O})_{sa}$. See [3], Theorem 4.3 for details.

**Standard Representations** For the non-exceptional simple EJAs, it will be useful to record what we will call their *standard* representations. It will also prove helpful to adopt the following abbreviations:

$$R_n = M_n(\mathbb{R})_{sa};\ C_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa},\ Q_n = M_n(\mathbb{H})_{sa}.$$

As above, we write $V_n$ for the spin factor $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. With this notation we have obvious embeddings $R_n \leq C_n \leq M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$. For $Q_n$, note that a quaternion $a+bi+cj+dk$ can be written as $(a+bi)+(c+di)j$, and so, can be represented by the pair of complex numbers $(a+bi, c+di)$. Thus, any $n \times n$ matrix of quaternions can be represented as a $2n \times 2n$ complex matrix having the form $\begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_1 & \Gamma_2 \\ -\overline{\Gamma}_2 & \overline{\Gamma}_1 \end{bmatrix}$ where the blocks $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are $n \times n$ complex matrices. This gives us a faithful representation of $Q_n$ in $M_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$, known as the *symplectic representation* [19]. There is also what we will call a *standard representation* of $V_n$ in $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$, where $n = 2k$ or $2k+1$. This is less obvious; the details are given in Appendix C.

[6] This is a finite dimensional, concrete representation. For the finite-dimensional algebras we are concerned with, this definition suffices.

**Involutions and Reversibility** By an *involution* on a complex $*$-algebra $M$, we mean a $*$-anti-automorphism of $M$ of period 2 — in more detail, a linear mapping $\Phi : M \to M$ such that $\Phi(a^*) = \Phi(a)^*$, $\Phi(ab) = \Phi(b)\Phi(a)$, and $\Phi(\Phi(a)) = a$ for all $a \in M$. A *real* involution is defined similarly, except that the mapping is only required to be real-linear.[7] It is straightforward that the set $M_{sa}^{\Phi} = \{a \in M | a = a^* = \Phi(a)\}$ of all self-adjoint fixed-points of $M$ under $\Phi$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $M_{sa}$. Indeed, if $a, b \in M_{sa}^{\phi}$, then $a \bullet b = \frac{1}{2}(ab + ba) \in M_{sa}$, and

$$\Phi(ab + ba) = \Phi(b)\Phi(a) + \Phi(a)\Phi(b) = ba + ab = ab + ba$$

so that $a \bullet b \in M_{sa}^{\Phi}$ as well. In fact, more is true: if $a_1, ..., a_n \in M_{sa}^{\Phi}$, then

$$\Phi(a_1 \cdots a_n + a_n \cdots a_1) = a_n \cdots a_1 + a_1 \cdots a_n$$

so that $a_1 \cdots a_n + a_n \cdots a_1 \in M_{sa}^{\Phi}$. More generally, a Jordan subalgebra of $M_{sa}$ having this property is said to be *reversible*. An abstract EJA $A$ is reversible iff it has a faithful (that is, injective) representation as a reversible Jordan subalgebra of some $*$-algebra $M$. If *all* of $A$'s faithful representations are reversible, then $A$ is said to be *universally reversible* (hereafter: UR).

In this language, then, all Jordan algebras of the form $M_{sa}^{\Phi}$ are reversible. All self-adjoint parts of real and complex matrix algebras are universally reversible, as are the quaternionic ones of rank 3 and higher (whence, all EJAs of rank $\geq 4$ are UR). The quaternionic bit $M_2(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$, which is isomorphic to $V_5$, is not universally reversible, but it is reversible, since its standard embedding into $M_4(\mathbb{C})$ is reversible: indeed, it's the set fixed points of the involution $\Phi(x) = -JxJ^t$ where $J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Spin factors $V_n$ with $n = 4$ or $n \geq 6$ are not reversible at all. For details, see [21]. Thus, the reversible *simple* EJAs are precisely those of the form $M_n(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$, $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ and $M_n(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$.

**The universal representation** In addition to the standard representations discussed above, every special EJA has a *universal* representation.

**Definition 3.3.** A *universal $C^*$ algebra* for a euclidean Jordan algebra $A$ is a complex $*$-algebra $C^*(A)$, plus an embedding $\psi_A : A \to C^*(A)_{sa}$, such that for $C^*$-algebra $\mathbf{M}$ and any Jordan homomorphism $\phi : A \to \mathbf{M}_{sa}$, there exists a unique $*$-homomorphism $\widehat{\phi} : C^*(A) \to \mathbf{M}$ with $\phi = \widehat{\phi} \circ \psi_A$.

For the existence of $C^*(A)$, see [3] or [22]. Universal $C^*$-algebras for a given EJA $A$ are unique up to canonical $*$-isomorphism, warranting our speaking of "the" universal $C^*$-algebra of $A$.[8] It is easy to see that any Jordan homorphism $A \to B$ lifts, via

[7] Our usage is slightly nonstandard here: an involution on a complex $*$-algebra is more frequently defined to be a conjugate-linear. The only involution in this sense that will concern us is $a \mapsto a^*$.

[8] In fact, by privileging any particular construction of $C^*(A)$, we can take this literally.

$\psi_A$ and $\psi_B$, to a $C^*$-homomorphism $C^*(A) \to C^*(B)$, and that this lifting respects composition of Jordan homomorphisms, so that $C^*(\ \cdot\ )$ defines a functor from the category of EJAs to the category of complex $*$-algebras. It can be shown that this functor is exact ([21], Theorem 4.1). It is an important fact that $A$ is exceptional iff $C^*(A) = \{0\}$. Otherwise, the embedding $\psi_A$ of $A$ into $C^*(A)$ is faithful, and takes the unit of $A$ to the unit of $C^*(A)$. In this case, we will often identify $A$ with its embedded image in $C^*(A)$.

If $A$ is special, $C^*(A)$ comes equipped with a unique involution that fixes every point of $A$. To see this, note that that the opposite algebra $C^*(A)^{\mathrm{op}}$ (the same vector space, equipped with reversed multiplication) is equally a universal $C^*$-algebra for $A$. Hence, there is a unique $*$-isomorphism $\Phi_A : C^*(A)^{\mathrm{op}} \to C^*(A)$ fixing all points of $A$. We can equally well regard $\Phi$ as a $*$-antiautomorphism of $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$; so regarded, $\Phi$ is self-inverse, hence an involution.

**Definition 3.4.** *We call the involution $\Phi : C^*(A) \to C^*(A)$ just described, the* canonical involution*, $\Phi_A$, on $C^*(A)$.*

As discussed above, the self-adjoint fixed-points of an involution $\Phi$ on a complex $*$-algebra $M$ constitute a Jordan subalgebra, $M_{sa}^{\Phi}$, of $M_{sa}$. With $\Phi_A$ the canonical involution on $C^*(A)_{sa}$, we have a Jordan embedding $A \leq C^*(A)_{sa}^{\Phi}$.

**Proposition 3.5** ([21], Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 4.4)**.** *With notation as above, $A$ is UR iff $A = C^*(A)_{sa}^{\Phi}$. More generally, if $A$ is UR and there exists an embedding $A \leq M_{sa}$ for a complex $*$-algebra $M$, and an involution $\Phi$ on $M$ fixing points of $A$, then the $*$-subalgebra of $M$ generated by $A$ is isomorphic to $C^*(A)$ and $\Phi$, restricted to this subalgebra, is the canonical involution.*

This characterization allows the explicit computation of universal $C^*$-algebras of UR EJAs [21]. For instance, $R_n = M_n(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$ generates $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ as a (complex) $*$-algebra, in which it sits as the set of symmetric self-adjoint matrices: in other words, the set of fixed points of the involution $\Phi(a) = a^T$. Thus, $C^*(R_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Similarly, the image of $M_n(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$ under the standard (symplectic) embedding into $M_{2n}(\mathbb{C}) = M_2(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$ is fixed by the involution $\Phi(a) = -Ja^TJ$ where $J$ is the block matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, with $\mathbf{1}$ the $n \times n$ identity matrix. For a third example, consider the embedding $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa} \to (M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C}))_{sa}$ given by $\psi(a) = (a, a^T)$: the image of this embedding generates $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$ as a $*$-algebra, and is exactly the set of fixed-points of the involution $\Phi(a, b) = (b^T, a^T)$. Thus, $C^*(C_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Note, in passing, that this also shows that there is no involution on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ fixing points of $C_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$. (Otherwise, $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ would be the universal $*$-algebra for $C_n$.)

The universal $C^*$-algebras for all simple, non-exceptional EJAs are are summarized in Table 1 below, along with the canonical involutions in the UR cases. For a spin factor $V_n$, the universal $C^*$-algebra is the complex Clifford algebra $\mathrm{Cliff}_{\mathbb{C}}(n)$ on $n$ generators [21]; these are tabulated separately in Table 1(b).

For contrast, Table 1(c) lists the complex matrix algebras into which $R_n, C_n$ and $Q_n$ are *standardly* embedded. We also list in Fig. 1 (c) algebras supporting what we are calling standard embeddings of the spin factors $V_n$; these agree with the universal ones for $n = 2k$, but for $n = 2k+1$, embed $V_n$ in $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ rather than the $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ of the universal embedding. Thus, all the targets of embeddings in Fig. 1(c) are *simple* complex matrix algebras.

| $A$ | $C^*(A)$ | $\Phi$ |
|---|---|---|
| $R_n$ | $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ | $a \mapsto a^T$ |
| $C_n$ | $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$ | $(a,b) \mapsto (b^T, a^T)$ |
| $Q_n$ | $M_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$ if $n > 2$ | $a \mapsto -JaJ$ |
| $V_n$ | $\mathrm{Cliff}_{\mathbb{C}}(n)$ | |

(a)
Universal embeddings

| $n$ $(k \in \mathbb{N}_+)$ | $\mathrm{Cliff}_{\mathbb{C}}(n)$ |
|---|---|
| $2k$ | $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ |
| $2k+1$ | $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ |

(b)
Clifford algebras

| $A$ | $\mathbf{M}$ |
|---|---|
| $R_n$ | $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ |
| $C_n$ | $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ |
| $Q_n$ | $M_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$ |
| $V_{2k}$ | $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ |
| $V_{2k+1}$ | $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ |

(c)
Standard embeddings

**Table 1:** Unversal and standard embeddings

Note that the spin factors $V_2, V_3, V_5$ correspond to the three types of quantum bits: $V_2 \simeq R_2$; $V_2 \simeq C_2$ and $V_5 \simeq Q_2$. This last, together with line 2 of Fig. 1 table (b), gives us the missing item in table (a):

$$C^*(Q_2) \simeq M_4(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_4(\mathbb{C}).$$

It will be helpful to record here two further facts about universal $C^*$ algebras. First, $C^*(A \oplus B) = C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$. This follows from the exactness of the $C^*(\ )$-functor. Combining this with Proposition 3.5, it follows that if $A$ and $B$ are both UR, so is $A \oplus B$. Details can be found in Appendix A.

## 3.4 The universal tensor product

The universal representation allows one to define a natural tensor product of special EJAs, first studied by H. Hanche-Olsen [21]:

**Definition 3.6.** The *universal* tensor product of two special EJAs $A$ and $B$, denoted $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ is the Jordan subalgebra of $C^*(A) \otimes C^*(B)$ generated by $A \otimes B$.

Some important facts about the universal tensor product are collected in the following:

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let $A$, $B$ and $C$ denote EJAs.*

*(a) If $\phi : A \to C$, $\psi : B \to C$ are unital Jordan homomorphisms with operator-commuting ranges, then there exists a unique Jordan homomorphism $A\widetilde{\otimes}B \to C$ taking $a \otimes b$ to $\phi(a) \bullet \psi(b)$ for all $a \in A$, $b \in B$.*

*(b) $C^*(A\widetilde{\otimes}B) = C^*(A) \otimes C^*(B)$ and $\Phi_{A\widetilde{\otimes}B} = \Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$.*

*(c) $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ is universally reversible unless one of the factors has a one-dimensional summand and the other has a representation onto a spin factor $V_n$ with $n = 4$ or $n \geq 6$.*

*(d) If $A$ is universally reversible, then $A\widetilde{\otimes}M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa} = (C^*(A) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}))_{sa}$.*

*(e) $u_{A\widetilde{\otimes}B} = u_A \otimes u_B = u_{C^*(A\widetilde{\otimes}B)}$.*

*Proof:* (a), (c), and (d) are Propositions 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, respectively, in [21]; (b) is observed in the vicinity of these propositions in [21], while (e) follows easily from the fact that $\psi^A(u_A) = u_{C^*(A)}$. $\square$

Table 1 (c) shows that if $A$ and $B$ are simple and non-trivial, $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ will always be UR, and hence, by Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 3.7 (b), the fixed-point set of $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$. Using this, one can compute $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ for simple $A$ and $B$ (with $n, k > 2$ in the case of $Q_n$ and $Q_k$) [21]:

| $\widetilde{\otimes}$ | $R_k$ | $C_k$ | $Q_k$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $R_n$ | $R_{nk}$ | $C_{nk}$ | $Q_{nk}$ |
| $C_n$ | $C_{nk}$ | $C_{nk} \oplus C_{nk}$ | $C_{2nk}$ |
| $Q_n$ | $Q_{nk}$ | $C_{2nk}$ | $R_{4nk}$ |

**Table 2:** Universal tensor products of simple UR EJAs

For $Q_2\widetilde{\otimes}Q_2$, we obtain the direct sum of four copies of $R_{16} = M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$. The details can be found in [20].

# 4 Composites of Jordan-Algebraic Systems

If $A$ is a euclidean Jordan algebra, recall that we take $G(A)$ to be the connected component of the identity in the group $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$ of order-automorphisms of $A$. Note that if $\phi \in G(A)$, then $\phi^\dagger \in G(A)$ as well. Henceforth, we shall treat Jordan models as

dynamical models, using $G(A)$ as the dynamical group. This is a reasonable choice. First, elements of $G(A)$ are exactly those automorphisms of $A_+$ that figure in the system's possible dynamics, as elements of one-parameter groups of automorphisms. This suggests that the "physical" dynamical group of a dynamical model based on $A$ should at least be a subgroup of $G(A)$, so that the latter is the least constrained choice. Moreover, $G(A)$, like the full group of order-automorphisms, acts transitively on the interior of the cone $A_+$, and its unit-preserving subgroup acts transitively on the set of *Jordan frames*, i.e., maximally informative sharp observables — or, equivalently, on maximal lists $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n)$ of sharply-distinguishable states. These transitivity properties, abstracted from the Jordan-algebraic setting, were among the postulates used (in somewhat different ways) by [41, 42] and [11] to derive the Jordan structure of probabilistic models, so it is not unreasonable to require that the dynamical group enjoy them. We conjecture that the only such subgroup of $G(A)$ is $G(A)$ itself.

This suggests, then, the following

**Definition 4.1.** A *composite* of EJAs $A$ and $B$ is an EJA $AB$, plus a bilinear mapping $\pi : A \otimes B \to AB$, such that

(a) $\pi$ makes $(AB, G(AB))$ a dynamical composite of $(A, G(A))$ and $(B, G(B))$, in the sense of Definition 2.3

(b) $(\phi \otimes \psi)^\dagger = \phi^\dagger \otimes \psi^\dagger$ for all $\phi, \psi \in G(A)$.

(c) $AB$ is generated, as a Jordan algebra, by (images of) pure tensors.

By Lemma 2.2, the mapping $\pi : A \otimes B \to AB$ is injective; hence, we can, and shall, identify $A \otimes B$ with its image in $AB$, writing $\pi(a, b)$ as $a \otimes b$.

Condition (b) is rather strong, but natural if we keep in mind that our ultimate aim is to construct dagger-compact categories of EJAs. Regarding condition (c), suppose $\pi : A \times B \to AB$ satisfied only (a) and (b): letting $A \odot B$ denote the Jordan subalgebra of $AB$ generated by $\pi(A \otimes B)$, one can show (Appendix E) that the co-restriction of $\pi$ to $A \odot B$ also satisfies (a) and (b); thus, any composite in the weaker sense defined by (a) and (b) contains a composite satisfying all three conditions.

In Section 5, Proposition 5.3, we will show that $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ is a composite in the sense of Definition 4.1. The main result of the present section is to show that any such composite $AB$ is a direct summand of $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$. In view of the table in Table 2, this severely limits the possibilities for $AB$.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let $p \in A$ and $q \in B$ be projections. Then $p \otimes q$ is a projection in $AB$, for any composite $AB$ of $A$ and $B$.*

*Proof:* By Lemma 3.1, there exist states $\alpha$ and $\beta$ on $A$ and $B$, respectively, with $\alpha(p) = \beta(q) = 1$. Hence, by condition (c) of Definition 2.1, there exists a state $\gamma$ on $AB$ with $\gamma(p \otimes q) = \alpha(p)\beta(q) = 1$. Invoking Lemma 3.1 again, $p \otimes q$ must be a projection in $AB$. □

This has an important consequence regarding the inner product on $AB$:

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let $AB$ be a composite of EJAs $A$ and $B$. Then for all $a, x \in A$ and all $b, y \in B$, $\langle a \odot x | b \odot y \rangle = \langle a|x\rangle\langle b|y\rangle$.*

The proof is given in Appendix D. It follows that, for $a, a' \in A$ and $b, b' \in B$, $\langle a \otimes b, a' \otimes b' \rangle = 0$ iff either $\langle a, a' \rangle = 0$ or $\langle b, b' \rangle = 0$.

**Proposition 4.4.** *For all $a \in A$, $b \in B$, $a \otimes u_B$ and $u_A \otimes b$ operator-commute in $AB$.*

*Proof:* Suppose $p \in A$ and $q \in B$ are projections, and let $p' = u_A - p$ and $q' = u_B - q$. Then we have

$$u_{AB} = u_A \otimes u_B = (p + p') \otimes (q + q') = p \otimes q + p' \otimes q + p \otimes q' + p' \otimes q'.$$

The four projections appearing on the right are mutually orthogonal, by 4.3, and sum to the unit in $AB$. Hence, $p \otimes u_B = p \otimes q + p \otimes q'$ and $u_A \otimes q = p \otimes q + p' \otimes q$ operator commute by [3], Lemma 1.48. Now let $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ be arbitrary: by spectral theory, we have $a = \sum_i t_i p_i$ and $b = \sum_j s_j q_j$ for pairwise orthogonal projections $p_i$ and $q_j$. Since $p_i \otimes u_B$ and $u_A \otimes q_j$ operator commute for all $i, j$, it follows that

$$a \otimes u_B = \sum_i t_i p_i \otimes u_B \quad \text{and} \quad u_A \otimes b = \sum_j s_j u_A \otimes q_j$$

also operator commute. □

## 4.1 The identity $(a \otimes u) \bullet (x \otimes y) = (a \bullet x) \otimes y$.

To this point, we have limited information—mainly Proposition 4.4—about how the Jordan structure of a composite $AB$ interacts with the Jordan structures of $A$ and $B$. Our goal in this subsection is to establish, for any $a \in A$ and any $x, y \in B$, the identity $(a \otimes u) \bullet (x \otimes y) = (a \bullet x) \otimes y$ — in other words, that $L_{a \otimes u_B}$ acts on $A \otimes B \leq AB$ as $L_a \otimes \mathbf{1}_B$, where $\mathbf{1}_B$ is the identity operator on $B$. This is non-trivial, since $AB$ need not be spanned by $A \otimes B$.

**One-parameter groups and exponentials** It will be helpful first to recall some basic facts about operator exponentials, or, equivalently, one-parameter groups of linear operators on finite-dimensional spaces (see, e.g., [15]). Let $V$ be a finite-dimensional real vector space, and $X$, a linear operator on $V$. Recall that $\phi(t) := e^{tX}$ is the unique function $\mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{V})$ satisfying the initial-value problem

$$\phi'(t) = X\phi(t); \quad \phi(0) = \mathbf{1}$$

(where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity operator on $V$). In particular, $\phi'(0) = X$. The function $\phi$ satisfies $\phi(t+s) = \phi(t)\phi(s)$ and hence, $\phi(t)\phi(-t) = \phi(0) = \mathbf{1}$, hence, as $\phi(0) = \mathbf{1}$, $\phi(t)$ is invertible, with $\phi(t)^{-1} = \phi(-t)$. In other words, $\phi$ is a one-parameter group of linear operators on $V$. Conversely, if $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{L}(V)$ is any continuous one-parameter group

of linear operators on $V$, then $\phi$ is differentiable, and $\phi(t) = e^{tX}$ where $X = \phi'(0)$. Notice, also, that in such a case we have

$$Xa = \frac{d}{dt}\phi(t)a|_{t=0}$$

for any vector $a \in V$.

For later reference, the following lemma collects some standard facts:

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let $X, Y$ be linear operators on a finite-dimensional inner product space $V$. Then*

*(a) $X$ commutes with $e^{tX}$ for all $t$;*

*(b) If $e^{tX}$ commutes with $e^{sY}$ for all $t, s$, then $X$ commutes with $Y$;*

*(c) $(e^{tX})^\dagger = e^{tX^\dagger}$.*

Note that, by (c), if $\phi(t)$ is a one-parameter group with $\phi'(0) = X$ hermitian, then $\phi(t)$ is hermitian for all $t$.

Now let $A$ be an EJA. For $a \in A$, define

$$\phi_a(t) := e^{tL_a} = e^{L_{ta}},$$

i.e., $\phi_a$ is the solution to the initial-value problem $\frac{d}{dt}\phi_a = L_a\phi_a$, $\phi_a(0) = \mathbf{1}$. By part (c) of Proposition 3.2, part (c), $\phi_a(t) = U_{e^{ta/2}}$; by part (b) of the same Proposition, this last is a positive mapping. Since $e^{tL_a}$ is invertible with inverse $e^{-tL_a} = e^{L_{-ta}}$, $\phi_a(t)$ is an order-automorphism belonging to $G(A)$. It follows that $L_a \in \mathfrak{g}_A$, the Lie group of the identity component $G(A)$ of $A$. Note that $\langle L_a x, y\rangle = \langle ax, y\rangle = \langle x, ay\rangle = \langle x, L_a y\rangle$ for all $x, y \in A$; that is, $L_a$ is self-adjoint. One can show that, conversely, a self-adjoint element of $\mathfrak{g}_A$ has the form $L_a$ for a unique $a \in A$. (See [18], pp. 6 and 49, for the details.)

We are now ready for the main result of this section.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let $AB$ be a composite (in the sense of Definition 4.1) of Jordan algebras $A$ and $B$. For all $a, x \in A$ and $b, y \in B$,*

$$(a \otimes u_B) \bullet (x \otimes y) = a \bullet x \otimes y \quad \textit{and} \quad (u_A \otimes b) \bullet (x \otimes y) = x \otimes b \bullet y$$

*Proof:* We prove the first identity; the second is handled similarly. Let $\phi(t)$ be a one-parameter group on $A$ with $\phi'(0) = L_a$. Then $\psi(t) := \phi(t) \otimes \mathbf{1}$ is a one-parameter group of automorphisms, by condition (c) of 2.3. Let $Y = \psi'(0) \in \mathfrak{g}_{AB}$; then, for all

$x \in A$ and $y \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(x \otimes y) &= \left[\frac{d}{dt}\psi(t)\right]_{t=0}(x \otimes y) \\ &= \left[\frac{d}{dt}(\psi(t)(x \otimes y))\right]_{t=0} \\ &= \left[\frac{d}{dt}\left(\phi(t)x \otimes y\right)\right]_{t=0} \\ &= \left(\left[\frac{d}{dt}\phi(t)\right]_{t=0} x\right) \otimes y \;=\; L_a x \otimes y \;=\; ax \otimes y. \end{aligned}$$

Subject to condition (c) of Definition 4.1, we have

$$(\phi_a(t) \otimes \mathbf{1})^\dagger = \phi_a(t)^\dagger \otimes \mathbf{1} = \phi_a(t) \otimes \mathbf{1}.$$

Hence, $Y$ is self-adjoint. As discussed above, it follows that there exists some $v \in AB$ with $Y = L_v$ on $A \otimes B$. Thus,

$$v(x \otimes y) = L_v(x \otimes y) = Y(x \otimes y) = ax \otimes y.$$

Setting $x = u_A$ and $y = u_B$, we have $v = vu_{AB} = v(u_A \otimes u_B) = au_A \otimes u_B = a \otimes u_B$, which gives the advertised result. □

Recall that, for $a \in A$, the mapping $U_a : A \to A$ is defined by $U_a = 2L_a^2 - L_{a^2}$.

**Corollary 4.7.** *In any composite $AB$ of EJAs $A$ and $B$, and for any $a \in A$, $b \in B$, $U_{a \otimes u_B}$ and $U_{u_A \otimes A}$ act on $A \otimes B$ as $U_a \otimes id_B$ and $id_A \otimes U_b$, respectively.*

## 4.2 Composites of Simple EJAs

We now show that if $A$ and $B$ are non-trivial *simple* EJAs — that is, if neither has any non-trivial direct summands — then any composite $AB$ must be special, universally reversible, and an ideal (a direct summand) of the maximal tensor product $A \widetilde{\otimes} B$. The rough idea is that, since $A$ and $B$ have rank at least two, the fact that products of distinguishable effects are distinguishable will yield at least four distinguishable effects in $AB$. If the latter were simple, this would be the end of the story; but we know from the case of universal tensor products (which we will ultimately show are dynamical composites in our sense) that composites can have non-trivial direct summands. Thus, need to work a bit harder, and show that every irreducible direct summand of $AB$ has rank at least 4.

An element $s \in A$ is called a *symmetry* iff $s^2 = u$.[9] In this case $U_s$ is a Jordan automorphism of $A$, with $U_s^2 = \mathrm{id}$ ([3], Prop. 2.34). Also note that $p := \frac{1}{2}(s + u)$ is a projection, and, conversely, if $p$ is a projection, then $s := 2p - u$ is a symmetry.

[9]Not to be confused with a symmetry *qua* order-automorphism.

Two projections $p, q \in A$ are *exchanged by a symmetry* $s \in A$ iff $U_s(p) = q$ (in which case, $p = U_s(q)$). More generally, $p$ and $q$ are *equivalent* iff there exists a finite sequence of symmetries $s_1, ...s_\ell$ with $q = (U_{s_\ell} \circ \cdots \circ U_{s_1})(p)$.

Now let $AB$ be a composite in the sense of Definition 4.1.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let $s \in A$ be a symmetry exchanging projections $p_1, p_2 \in A$, and let $t \in B$ be a symmetry exchanging projections $q_1, q_2 \in B$. Then $s \otimes u_B$ and $u_A \otimes t$ are symmetries in $AB$, and $U_{u_A \otimes t} U_{s \otimes u_B}(p_1 \otimes q_1) = p_2 \otimes q_2$. In particular, the projections $p_1 \otimes q_1$ and $p_2 \otimes q_2$ are equivalent.*

*Proof:* $(s \otimes u_B)^2 = s^2 \otimes u_B = u_A \otimes u_B = u_{AB}$ by Proposition 4.6. Similarly for $u_A \otimes t$. Now by Corollary 4.7, we have

$$U_{u_A \otimes t} U_{s \otimes u_B}(p_1 \otimes q_1) = U_{u_A \otimes t}(U_s(p_1) \otimes q_1) = U_s(p_1) \otimes U_t(q_1) = p_2 \otimes q_2. \ \square$$

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let $AB$ be a composite of simple, non-trivial Jordan algebras $A$ and $B$. Then $AB$ is a special, universally reversible EJA.*

*Proof:* We shall show that every irreducible direct summand of $AB$ has rank $\geq 4$, from which the result follows. Decompose $AB$ as a direct sum of simple ideals, say $AB = \bigoplus_\alpha M_\alpha$. Let $\pi_\alpha : AB \to M_\alpha$ be the corresponding projections, and let $u_\alpha := \pi_\alpha(u_{AB})$ be the unit in $M_\alpha$. Suppose now that $\{p_1, ..., p_n\}$ is a Jordan frame in $A$ and $\{q_1, ..., q_m\}$ is a Jordan frame in $B$. By [3] Lemma 3.19, there are symmetries in $AB$ exchanging the $p_i$, and there are symmetries in $B$ exchanging the $q_j$. By Lemma 4.8, therefore, the projections $p_i \otimes q_j$ are pairwise equivalent. By [3] Lemma 3.9, therefore, these projections have the same central cover $c$. This means that for each $\alpha$, the projection $\pi_\alpha : AB \to M_\alpha$ takes none of the projections $p_i \otimes q_j$ to the zero projection in $M_\alpha$, or it takes all of them to zero — the former case arising exactly when $u_\alpha \leq c$, and the latter, when $u_\alpha c = c u_\alpha = 0$. If $M_\alpha$ is of the first type, $\{\pi_\alpha(p_i \otimes q_j) | i = 1, ..., n, j = 1, ..., m\}$ consists of $nm$ distinct orthogonal projections in $M_\alpha$, summing to the unit $\pi_\alpha(u) =: u_\alpha$. Hence, the rank of $M_\alpha$ is at least $nm$. In particular, since $A$ and $B$ are non-trivial, $n, m \geq 2$, whence, $M_\alpha$ has rank at least 4, and hence, is special.

Now let $p, q$ be arbitrary projections in $A$ and $B$, respectively: extending each to a Jordan frame, as above, we see that for all $\alpha$, if $\pi_\alpha(p \otimes q) \neq 0$, then $M_\alpha$ is special. Hence, $p \otimes q$ belongs to the direct sum of the special summands of $AB$, i.e., to $M_{\rm sp}$. Since projections $p \otimes q$ generate $A \odot B$, the latter is special.

The argument also shows that each simple direct summand $M_\alpha$, in addition to being special, is not a spin factor, and hence, is UR. It follows from this, plus the fact that direct sums of universally reversible EJAs are again UR, that $AB$ must be UR. $\square$

**Corollary 4.10.** *If $A$ is simple and $B$ is exceptional, there exists no composite $AB$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 1.*

*Proof:* The mapping $B \to AB$ given by $b \mapsto u_A \otimes b$ is a faithful Jordan homomorphism, by Proposition 4.6. But there exists no faithful Jordan homomorphism from $B$ into a special euclidean Jordan algebra. $\square$

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let $A$ and $B$ be simple, non-trivial JC-algebras. Then $AB$ is an ideal in $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$.*

*Proof:* By Proposition 4.6, we have Jordan homomorphisms $A, B \to AB$ with operator-commuting ranges. Since $AB$ is special, i.e., a JC-algebra, elements of $AB$ operator commute iff their images in $C^*(AB)$ operator commute ([21], Lemma 5.1). Thus, we have Jordan homomorphisms $A, B \to C^*(AB)$ with operator-commuting ranges. The universal property of $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ yields a Jordan homomorphism $\phi : A\widetilde{\otimes}B \to C^*(AB)$ taking (the image of) $a \otimes b$ in $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ to (the image of) $a \otimes b$ in $C^*(AB)$. Since both $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ and $AB$ are generated by pure tensors, $\phi$ takes $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ onto $AB$. Letting $K$ denote the kernel of $\phi$, an ideal of $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$, we have $A\widetilde{\otimes}B = K' \oplus K$, where $K'$ is the complementary ideal; the mapping $\phi$ factors through the projection $A\widetilde{\otimes}B \to K'$ to give an isomorphism $K' \simeq AB$. $\square$

Combined with table 2, Corollary 4.11 sharply restricts the possibilities for composites of simple EJAS. In particular, it follows that *if $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ is itself simple*, then $AB \simeq A\widetilde{\otimes}B$. In other words, in this case the universal tensor product is the only "reasonable" tensor product (to the extent that we think the conditions of Definition 4.1 constitute reasonableness, in this context). If $A = B = C_n$, so that $A\widetilde{\otimes}B = M_{n^2}(\mathbb{C})_{sa} \oplus M_{n^2}(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$, we have another candidate, i.e., the usual quantum-mechanical composite $M_{n^2}(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$. If $A = B = M_2(\mathbb{H})$ (that is, if $A$ and $B$ are two quaternionic bits), we have $A\widetilde{\otimes}B = M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa} \oplus M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa} \oplus M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa} \oplus M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$, giving us four possibilities for $AB$. *These exhaust the possibilities for real, complex and quaternionic quantum composites!*

# 5 EJC-algebras

In view of Theorem 4.9 and Corollary 4.10, we now restrict our attention to special EJAs. A *JC-algebra* is variously defined as a norm-closed Jordan subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H})$ for a real or complex Hilbert space $\mathbf{H}$, or as a Jordan algebra that is Jordan-isomorphic to such an algebra. In finite dimensions, any JC algebra is euclidean, and any special euclidean Jordan algebra is JC (on the second definition). Here, we consider EJAs that are embedded, not necessarily in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H})$ for a specific Hilbert space, but in some definite complex $*$-algebra.

**Definition 5.1.** An *embedded euclidean JC-algebra* is a pair $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ where $\mathbf{M}_A$ is a finite-dimensional complex $*$-algebra and $A$ is a unital Jordan subalgebra of $(\mathbf{M}_A)_{sa}$.

For aesthetic reasons, we abbreviate the phrase "embedded euclidean JC" by EJC (rather than EEJC), letting the initial E stand simultaneously for *embedded* and *euclidean*. In this section, we develop a canonical tensor product for EJC algebras, and use this to construct several symmetric monoidal categories of EJC-algebras. In one case, we obtain a category of reversible EJAs, with a monoidal product extending that of ordinary complex matrix algebras; in another, which we call **InvQM**, we restrict attention to EJAs that arise as fixed-point algebras of involutions on complex $*$-algebras (a class that includes all universally reversible EJCs, but also includes the quaternionic bit, $M_2(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$, as symplectically embedded in $M_4(\mathbb{C})$. Here, the monoidal structure agrees with the Hanche-Olsen tensor product in the cases in which the factors are UR.

For any $*$-algebra $\mathbf{M}$ and any set $S \subseteq \mathbf{M}_{sa}$, let $J(S)$ denote the Jordan subalgebra of $\mathbf{M}_{sa}$ generated by $S$. (We should probably write this as $J_{\mathbf{M}}(S)$, but context will generally make the usage unambiguous. See below for an example!)

**Definition 5.2.** The *canonical tensor product* of $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ is $(A \odot B, \mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B)$, where $A \odot B := J(A \otimes B) \subseteq \mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B$, the Jordan subalgebra of $(\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B)_{sa}$ generated by $A \otimes B$. [10]

Note that this makes it a matter of definition that $\mathbf{M}_{A \odot B} = \mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B$. In particular, if $A$ and $B$ are universally embedded, so that $\mathbf{M}_A = C^*(A)$ and $\mathbf{M}_B = C^*(B)$, then $A \odot B = A \widetilde{\otimes} B$, so that $\mathbf{M}_{A \widetilde{\otimes} B} = C^*(A) \otimes C^*(B)$ by definition; but the fact that this last is $C^*(A \widetilde{\otimes} B)$ (whence, $A \odot B$ is UR) is a theorem.

Let us call an EJC $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ *reversible* iff $A$ is reversible in $\mathbf{M}_A$. Note that if $A$ is a simple EJC *standardly* embedded in $\mathbf{M}_A$, then $A$ is reversible iff $A = R_n, C_n$ or $Q_n$ for some $n$.

**Proposition 5.3.** *If $(A, M_A)$ and $(B, M_B)$ are* reversible *EJC-algebras then their canonical tensor product $A \odot B$ is a composite in the sense of 4.1.*

*Proof:* We must show that $A \odot B$ is a dynamical composite, in the sense of Definition 2.3. In particular, it must be a composite of probabilistic models in the sense of Definition 2.1. Conditions (a)-(c) of that definition are easily verified: That $u_{AB} = u_A \otimes u_B$ follows from the unitality of the embeddings $A \mapsto \mathbf{M}_A$, $B \mapsto \mathbf{M}_B$ and $AB \mapsto \mathbf{M}_{AB}$. For all $a, x \in (\mathbf{M}_A)_{sa}$ and $b, y \in (\mathbf{M}_B)_{sa}$, we have

$$\langle a \otimes b | x \otimes y \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(ax \otimes by) = \mathrm{Tr}(ax)\mathrm{Tr}(by) = \langle a|x\rangle\langle b|y\rangle$$

Thus, for any states $\alpha = \langle a|$ and $\beta = \langle b|$, where $a \in A_+$ and $b \in B_+$, we have a state $\gamma = \langle a \otimes b|$ on $AB$ with $\gamma(x \otimes y) = \alpha(x)\beta(y)$ for all $x \in A_+$, $y \in B_+$.

That $A \odot B$ satisfies the additional conditions required to be a *dynamical* composite in the sense of Definition 2.3 is not trivial. However, using a result of Upmeier on the extension of derivations on reversible JC-algebras [38], one can show that

[10] When $\mathbf{M}_A = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ for some $n$ and similarly for $B$, this agrees with a construction by Jamjoom, Def. 2.1 in [26].

any $\phi \in G(A)$ extends to an element $\widehat{\phi} \in G((\mathbf{M}_A)_{sa})$ that preserves $A$, and that $\widehat{\phi} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{M_B}$ is an order-automorphism of $(\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B)_{sa}$ preserving $A \odot B$. It follows that $\widehat{\phi} \otimes \widehat{\psi} = (\widehat{\phi} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{M}_B}) \circ (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{M}_A} \otimes \widehat{\psi})$ preserves $A \odot B$ as well. It is not difficult to verify that $(\widehat{\phi} \otimes \widehat{\psi})^\dagger = \widehat{\phi^\dagger} \otimes \widehat{\psi^\dagger}$. The details are presented in Appendix F. Thus $A \odot B$ satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of Definition 4.1. Condition (c) is immediate from the definition of $A \odot B$. $\square$

Combining this with Theorem 4.9, we see that if $A$ and $B$ are simple reversible EJCs for which $A \widetilde{\otimes} B$ is also simple, then the canonical and universal tensor products of $A$ and $B$ coincide. This covers all cases except those involving two factors of the form $C_n$ and $C_k$, and those involving $Q_2$ as a factor. In fact, many of the latter are covered by the following.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ be reversible EJCs with $A$ generating $M_A$ and $B$ generating $M_B$ as $*$-algebras. Suppose $M_A$ and $M_B$ carry involutions $\Phi$ and $\Psi$, respectively, with $\Phi$ fixing points of $A$ and $\Psi$ fixing points of $B$ (i.e. $A \subseteq \mathbf{M}_A^\Phi$ and $B \subseteq \mathbf{M}_B^\Phi$). Then $A \odot B = (\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B)_{sa}^{\Phi \otimes \Psi}$, the set of self-adjoint fixed points of $\Phi \otimes \Psi$.*

*Proof:* By the preceding proposition, $A \odot B$ is a dynamical composite of $A$ and $B$; hence, by Theorem 4.9, $A \odot B$ is universally reversible. Since $\Phi \otimes \Psi$ fixes points of $A \otimes B$, it also fixes points of the Jordan algebra this generates in $M_A \otimes M_B$, i.e., of $A \odot B$. But then, by Proposition 3.5, $A \odot B$ is exactly the set of fixed points of $\Phi \otimes \Psi$. $\square$

As an example, the quaternionic bit $Q_2$, standardly embedded in $M_4(\mathbb{C}) = M_2(M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ as the set of block matrices of the form $\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ -\overline{b} & \overline{a} \end{bmatrix}$ with $a$ self-adjoint, is exactly the fixed-point set of the involution $\Phi(x) = -Jx^T J$, where $J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ is the set of self-adjoint fixed points of $\Phi \otimes \Phi$ acting on $M_4(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_4(\mathbb{C}) = M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$. From this, it follows that $Q_2 \odot Q_2 \simeq R_{16} = M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$. For details, see Appendix B. Notice that Corollary 5.4 applies equally to all simple, universally embedded EJCs, *and* to all *standardly* embedded EJCs *except* for $C_n$ (recalling here that no (complex-linear) involution on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ fixes all points of $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$).

**Canonical composites of standardly embedded, reversible EJAs** It follows from Proposition 5.3, together with Corollary 4.11 that the canonical and universal tensor products coincide for simple, reversible EJCs whose universal tensor products are simple. This covers all cases except for those in which one factor is $M_2(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$ (the quaternionic bit), and those in which both factors have the form $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ for some $n$. Restricting attention to standardly embedded EJCs, these missing cases can be computed directly: see appendix B and [20]. The results are summarized in the following table. Recall here the abbreviations $R_n = M_n(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$, $C_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ and

$Q_n = M_n(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$.

| $\odot$ | $R_n$ | $C_n$ | $Q_n$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $R_m$ | $R_{mn}$ | $C_{mn}$ | $Q_{mn}$ |
| $C_m$ | $C_{mn}$ | $C_{mn}$ | $C_{2mn}$ |
| $Q_m$ | $Q_{mn}$ | $C_{2mn}$ | $R_{4mn}$ |

Table 3: $\odot$ for standardly embedded, reversible EJCs

**Associativity** We now establish that the canonical tensor product is associative, setting the stage for the construction of symmetric monoidal categories of EJCs in Section 6.

**Proposition 5.5.** *$\odot$ is associative. More precisely, the associator mapping $\alpha : \mathbf{M}_A \otimes (\mathbf{M}_B \otimes \mathbf{M}_C) \to (\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B) \otimes \mathbf{M}_C$ carries $A \odot (B \odot C)$ isomorphically onto $(A \odot B) \odot C$.*

The essence of the proof is the following Lemma.

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$ be $*$-algebras, and let $A$ and $B$ be Jordan subalgebras of $\mathbf{M}_{sa}$ and $\mathbf{N}_{sa}$, respectively. Then $J(A \otimes J(B)) = J(A \otimes B)$*[11].

*Proof of Lemma 5.6*: We make use of the following notation. If $X$ and $Y$ are subsets (note: not necessarily subspaces) of $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$, respectively, let

$$X \bullet Y \ := \ \{\, a \bullet b \mid a \in X, b \in Y \,\};$$

similarly, $X + Y$ is the set of sums $a + b$ with $a \in X$, $b \in Y$, and, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $tX$ consists of multiples $ta$ of elements $a \in X$. Finally, we write $X \circledcirc Y$ for the set $\{a \otimes b | a \in X, b \in Y\}$ of pure tensors of elements in $X$ and $Y$. Note that if $X$ and $Y$ happen to be subspaces of $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$, respectively, then $J(X \circledcirc Y) = J(X \otimes Y)$.

Now let $\mathcal{N}$ denote the set of all subsets $Y$ of $\mathbf{N}$ such that

(i) $B \subseteq Y \subseteq J(B)$, and

(ii) $A \circledcirc Y \subseteq J(A \circledcirc B)$.

Note that $B \in \mathcal{N}$; in particular, then, $\mathcal{N}$ is non-empty. We are going to show first that $J(B) = \bigcup \mathcal{N}$.

*Claim 1:* If $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{N}$, then the sets $Y_1 \bullet Y_2$, $Y_1 + Y_2$ and $tY_1$ ($t$ any real scalar) belong to $\mathcal{N}$.

To see this, suppose that $y_1 \in Y_1 \in \mathcal{N}$ and $y_2 \in Y_2 \in \mathcal{N}$. Then for any $a \in A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a \otimes (y_1 \bullet y_2) &= a \otimes \frac{1}{2}(y_1 y_2 + y_2 y_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[(a \otimes y_1 y_2) + (a \otimes y_2 y_1)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[(a \otimes y_1)(1 \otimes y_2) + (1 \otimes y_2)(a \otimes y_1)] \\ &= (a \otimes y_1) \bullet (1 \otimes y_2). \end{aligned}$$

[11]Note that on the left, $J(A \otimes J(B))$ refers to the Jordan subalgebra of $(A \otimes B)_{sa}$ generated by $A \otimes J(B)$, where $J(B)$ refers to the Jordan subalgebra of $B_{sa}$ generated by $F$.

Since $A \circledcirc Y_1$ and $A \circledcirc Y_2$ are both, by assumption, contained in $J(A \circledcirc B)$, the last expression defines an element of $J(A \otimes B)$. Since $a$ is arbitrary here, all pure tensors from $A \circledcirc (Y_1 \bullet Y_2)$ belong to $J(A \circledcirc B)$. Since the latter is a subspace of $(\mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{N})_{sa}$, it follows that linear combinations of pure tensors from $A \circledcirc (N_1 \bullet N_2)$ are contained in $J(A \circledcirc B)$ as well. [Needed?] Finally, notice that $B \subseteq Y_1$ and $B \subseteq Y_2$ implies that $B \subseteq Y_1 \bullet Y_2$ (for instance, express $b \in B$ as $b \bullet 1$). The corresponding claims for $Y_1 + Y_2$ and $tY_1$ are straightforward, since $a \otimes (y_1 + y_2) = (a \otimes y_1) + (a \otimes y_2)$ and $a \otimes ty_1 = t(a \otimes y_1)$.

Now let $J = \bigcup \mathcal{N}$. *Claim 2:* $J = J(B)$. Since $B \subseteq J \subseteq J(B)$, it's enough to show that $J$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $\mathbf{N}_{sa}$. Let $y_1, y_2 \in J$: then for some $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $y_1 \in Y_1$ and $y_2 \in Y_2$. By Claim 1, $y_1 \bullet y_2 \in Y_1 \bullet Y_2 \in \mathcal{N}$, $y_1 + y_2 \in N_1 + Y_2 \in \mathcal{N}$, and $ty_1 \in tY_1 \in \mathcal{N}$; hence, $y_1 \bullet y_2$, $y_1 + y_2$ and $ty_1$ belong to $J$. In other words, $J$ is closed under scalar multiplication, addition and the Jordan product. This proves Claim 2.

We now use the fact that $J(B) = \bigcup \mathcal{N}$ to show that $J(A \otimes J(B)) = J(A \otimes B)$. Let $\tau = \sum_i a_i \otimes y_i$ be an arbitrary element of $A \otimes J(B)$. Since $J(B) = \bigcup \mathcal{N}$, for each $i$, $y_i \in Y_i$ for some $Y_i \in \mathcal{N}$. But then, by definition of $\mathcal{N}$, $a_i \otimes y_i \in A \otimes Y_i \subseteq J(A \otimes B)$; since the latter is a subspace of $\mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{N}$, $\tau \in J(A \otimes B)$ as well. Thus, $A \otimes J(B) \subseteq J(A \otimes B)$.

It now follows that $A \otimes B \subseteq A \otimes J = A \otimes J(B) \subseteq J(A \otimes B)$, hence, that $J(A \otimes B) \subseteq J(A \otimes J(B)) \subseteq J(A \otimes B)$. $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.5:* Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$, $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ and $(C, \mathbf{M}_C)$ be EJC-algebras. We need to show that the associator mapping $\alpha : \mathbf{M}_A \otimes (\mathbf{M}_B \otimes \mathbf{M}_C) \to (\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B) \otimes \mathbf{M}_C$ carries $A \odot (B \odot C)$ onto $(A \odot B) \odot C$. Applying Lemma 2, we have

$$A \odot (B \odot C) = J(A \otimes J(B \otimes C)) = J(A \otimes (B \otimes C))$$

and

$$(A \odot B) \odot C = J(J(A \otimes B) \otimes C) = J((A \otimes B) \otimes C).$$

The associator mapping is a $*$-isomorphism, and carries $A \otimes (B \otimes C)$ to $(A \otimes B) \otimes C$. Hence, it also carries $J(A \otimes (B \otimes C))$ onto $J((A \otimes B) \otimes C)$. $\square$

**Direct sums** If $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ are two embedded EJAs, define $(A, \mathbf{M}_A) \oplus (B, \mathbf{M}_B) = (A \oplus B, \mathbf{M}_A \oplus \mathbf{M}_B)$, where the embedding of $A \oplus B$ in $\mathbf{M}_A \oplus \mathbf{M}_B$ is the obvious one. One can easily check that for sets $X \subseteq \mathbf{M}_A$ and $Y \subseteq \mathbf{M}_B$, $J(X \oplus Y) = J(X) \oplus J(Y)$. Using this, and the distributivity of tensor products over direct sums in the contexts of vector spaces and $*$-algebras, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A \odot (B \oplus C) = J(A \otimes (B \oplus C)) &= J((A \otimes B) \oplus (A \otimes C)) \\ &= J(A \otimes B) \oplus J(A \otimes C) \\ &= (A \odot B) \oplus (A \odot C) \end{aligned}$$

(where $J$ refers variously to generated Jordan subalgebras of $\mathbf{M}_A \otimes (\mathbf{M}_B \oplus \mathbf{M}_C)$), $(\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B) \oplus \mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_C)$, $\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B$, and $\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_C$).

# 6 Monoidal Categories of EJC-algebras

As discussed in Section 2, a physical theory ought to be represented by a category, in which objects correspond to systems and morphisms, to physical processes. An obvious candidate for a category in which objects are embedded JC-algebras is the following.

**Definition 6.1.** Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ be EJC-algebras. A linear mapping $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ is *Jordan preserving* iff $\phi(A) \subseteq B$. The category **EJC** has, as objects, EJC-algebras, and, as morphisms, *completely positive* Jordan-preserving mappings.

In view of Proposition 5.5, one might guess that **EJC** is symmetric-monoidal under $\odot$. There is certainly a natural choice for the monoidal unit, namely $I = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$. However, the following examples show that tensor products of **EJC** morphisms are generally not morphisms.

**Example 6.2.** Let $(A, C^*(A))$ and $(B, C^*(B))$ be simple, non-trivial, universally embedded EJCs, and suppose that $B$ is not UR (e.g., the spin factor $V_4$). Suppose, further, that $A\widetilde{\otimes}B$ is irreducible — for instance, let $A = R_n$ for any $n$. Let $\widehat{B}$ be the set of fixed points of the canonical involution $\Phi_B$ (cf. Definition 3.4). Then by Corollary 4.11, $A \odot B = A\widetilde{\otimes}B$, the set of fixed points of $\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B$. In particular, $u_A \otimes \widehat{B}$ is contained in $A \odot B$. Now let $\alpha$ be a state on $C^*(A)$: this is CP, and trivially Jordan-preserving, and so, a morphism in **EJC**. But

$$(\alpha \otimes \mathrm{id}_B)(u_A \otimes \widehat{B}) = \alpha(u_A)\widehat{B} = \widehat{B},$$

which by Proposition 3.5 is larger than $B$ because $B$ is not UR. So $f \otimes \mathrm{id}_B$ isn't Jordan-preserving.

The next example is similar:

**Example 6.3.** Let $C_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ and $R_k = M_k(\mathbb{R})_{sa}$, as usual. Consider these as standardly embedded, i.e., consider the EJCs $(C_n, M_n(\mathbb{C}))$ and $(R_k, M_k(\mathbb{C}))$, where in the latter, $R_k$ is embedded as the set $k \times k$ complex matrices with real entries, i.e., the set of self-adjoint symmetric $k \times k$ complex matrices. Then we have

$$(C_n, M_n(\mathbb{C})) \odot (R_k, M_k(\mathbb{C})) = (C_{nk}, M_{nk}(\mathbb{C}))$$

where the embedding of $C_{nk}$ in $M_{nk}(\mathbb{C})$ is the standard one. Now let $\alpha$ be a state on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, and let $b$ be any self-adjoint matrix in $M_k(\mathbb{C})$. Then $\mathbf{1}_n \otimes b$ is self-adjoint in $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_k(\mathbb{C}) = M_{nk}(\mathbb{C})$, and $(\alpha \otimes \mathrm{id}_{M_k}(\mathbb{C}))(\mathbf{1}_n \otimes b) = b$. Since $b$ needn't belong to $R_k$, the mapping $\alpha \otimes \mathrm{id}_{M_k}(\mathbb{C})$ isn't Jordan-preserving.

.

## 6.1 Completely Jordan Preserving Maps

Examples 6.2 and 6.3 suggest the following adaptation of the notion of complete positivity to our setting.

**Definition 6.4.** A linear mapping $\phi : (A, \mathbf{M}_A) \to (B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ is *completely Jordan preserving* (CJP) iff, for any embedded JC-algebra $(C, \mathbf{M}_C)$, the mapping $\phi \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_C}$ is positive, and takes $A \odot C$ into $B \odot C$.

Note that this implies that $\phi$ is both Jordan-preserving (take $C = \mathbb{R}$) and completely positive (take $C = C_n$ for any $n$).

**Lemma 6.5.** *If $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ is CJP, then for any $(C, \mathbf{M}_C)$, $\phi \otimes id_{\mathbf{M}_C}$ is again CJP.*

*Proof:* If $(D, \mathbf{M}_D)$ is another embedded JC-algebra, consider $(C \odot D, \mathbf{M}_C \otimes \mathbf{M}_D)$. The associativity of $\odot$ gives us

$$(\phi \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_C}) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_D} = \phi \otimes (\mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_C \otimes \mathbf{M}_D}).$$

Since $\phi$ is CJP, the latter caries $A \odot (C \odot D)$ into $B \odot (C \odot D)$. Since $\odot$ is associative, this tells us that $(\phi \otimes \mathrm{id}_C) \otimes \mathrm{id}_D$ carries $(A \odot C) \odot D$ into $(B \odot C) \odot D$. $\square$

While all CJP morphisms are CP, Example 6.2 shows that the converse is false. On the other hand, the class of CJP morphisms is still quite large.

**Example 6.6.** Let $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ be a $*$-homomorphism taking $A$ to $B$. Then $\phi \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_C}$ is again a $*$-homomorphism, and hence, takes the Jordan subalgebra generated by $A \otimes C$ to that generated by $B \otimes C$, i.e., sends $A \odot C$ into $B \odot C$. So $\phi$ is CJP.

**Example 6.7.** Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ be an embedded JC-algebra, and let $a \in A$. The mapping $U_a : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_A$ given by $U_a(b) = aba$ is completely positive, and can be expressed in terms of the Jordan product on $\mathbf{M}_A$ as

$$U_a(b) = 2a \bullet (a \bullet b) - (a^2) \bullet b$$

i.e., $U_a = 2L_a^2 - L_{a^2}$, where $L_a$ is the operator of left Jordan multiplication. Since $A$ is a Jordan subagebra of $(\mathbf{M}_A)_{sa}$, $U_a(b) \in A$ for all $a, b \in A$. Thus, $U_a$ is a morphism. Now if $(C, \mathbf{M}_C)$ is another embedded JC-algebra, we have

$$U_a \otimes U_c = U_{a \otimes c}$$

for all $c \in \mathbf{M}_C$; in particular,

$$U_a \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_C} = U_a \otimes U_{\mathbf{1}} = U_{a \otimes \mathbf{1}}.$$

Since $a \otimes \mathbf{1} \in A \odot C$, it follows that $U_a$ is CJP.

**Proposition 6.8.** *Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$, $(A', \mathbf{M}_{A'})$, $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$, $(B', \mathbf{M}_{B'})$ and and $(C, \mathbf{M}_C)$ be EJC-algebras.*

*(i) If $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ and $\psi : \mathbf{M}_B \to \mathbf{M}_C$ are CJP, then so is $\psi \circ \phi$, and*

*(ii) if $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ and $\psi : \mathbf{M}_{A'} \to \mathbf{M}_{B'}$ are CJP, then so is $\phi \otimes \psi : \mathbf{M}_{A \odot A'} = \mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_{A'} \to \mathbf{M}_B \otimes \mathbf{M}_{B'} = \mathbf{M}_{B \odot B'}$.*

$$\phi \otimes \psi = (\phi \otimes id_{\mathbf{M}_{B'}}) \circ (id_{\mathbf{M}_A} \otimes \psi)$$

*is again CJP.*

*Proof:* (i) is straightforward, and (ii) follows from (i) and Lemma 6.5. □

Thus, EJC-algebras and CJP maps form a symmetric monoidal category, which we will call **CJP**, with tensor unit $I = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$.

**Relatively CJP Mappings** The category **CJP** has an undesirable feature: Any positive mapping $f : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbb{R}$ is automatically Jordan preserving, yet, as Example 6.2 illustrates, for a non-UR $B$, $f \otimes \mathrm{id}_B$ need not be. In other words, there need be no CJP morphisms $A \to I$. In particular, states of $A$ need not be CJP morphisms.

In some cases, we can remedy this difficulty by relativising the definition of CJP mappings to a particular class $\mathcal{C}$ of embedded JC algebras. In what follows, assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is closed under $\odot$ and contains the tensor unit $I = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$.

**Definition 6.9.** Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ belong to $\mathcal{C}$. A positive linear mapping $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ is *relatively CJP* with respect to $\mathcal{C}$ if, for all $(C, \mathbf{M}_C) \in \mathcal{C}$, the mapping $\phi \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{M}_C}$ is positive and maps $A \odot C$ into $B \odot C$. We denote the set of all such maps by $\mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$.

Note that $\phi$'s being relatively CJP with respect to $\mathcal{C}$ does not imply that $\phi$ is CP, unless $\mathcal{C}$ contains $C_n$ for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Nevertheless, exactly as in the proof of Proposition 6.8, we see that if $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\phi \in \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(B, C)$, then $\psi \circ \phi \in \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, C)$, and also that if $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\phi \in \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ and $\psi \in \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(C, D)$, then $\phi \otimes \psi \in \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}(A \otimes C, B \otimes D)$. In other words, $\mathcal{C}$ becomes a symmetric monoidal category with relatively CJP mappings as morphisms. We denote this category by $\mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Here are three important ones.

**Example 6.10** (The category $\mathbb{C}$QM)**.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the class of hermitian parts of complex $*$-algebras with standard embeddings. Then $\phi$ belongs to $\mathrm{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}$ iff $\phi$ is CP. Evidently, this category is essentially orthodox, mixed-state QM with superselection rules. From now on, we shall call this category $\mathbb{C}$QM.

**Example 6.11** (The category **RSE**)**.** Let $\mathbf{RSE} = \mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of reversible EJCs with standard embeddings. By Table 2, plus the distributivity of $\oplus$ over direct sums, the latter is closed under $\odot$. The category **RSE** represents a kind of

unification of finite-dimensional real, complex and quaternionic quantum mechanics, in so far as its objects are the Jordan algebras associated with real, complex and quaternionic quantum systems, and direct sums of these. Moreover, as restricted to complex (or real) systems, its compositional structure is the standard one. However, Example 6.3 shows that not every quantum-mechanical process — in particular, not even processes that prepare states — will count as a morphism in **RSE**, so this unification comes at a high cost.

**Example 6.12** (The category **URUE**)**.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the class of universally reversible EJCs with universal embeddings. This is closed under $\odot$ by Corollary 5.4 and Proposition 3.5. We denote the category $\mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}$ by **URUE**. This is closer to being a legitimate "unified" quantum theory, although it omits the quaternionic bit (which is reversible, but not universally so). Even as restricted to complex quantum systems, however, it differs from orthodox QM in two interesting ways. First, and most conspicuously, the tensor product is not the usual one: $C_n \widetilde{\otimes} C_k = C_{nk} \oplus C_{nk}$, rather than $C_{nk}$. Secondly, it allows some processes that orthodox QM does not. Any CP mapping $\phi : C^*(A) \to C^*(B)$ intertwining the involutions $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$ (that is, $\Phi_B \circ \phi = \phi \circ \Phi_A$) is relatively CJP, i.e., a morphism in **URUE**. In particular, the the mapping on $C^*(C_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$ that swaps the two summands is a morphism. Since the image of $C_n$ in $C^*(C_n)$ consists of pairs $(a, a^T)$, this mapping effects the transpose automorphism on $C_n$. This is not permitted in orthodox QM, as the transpose is not a CP mapping on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. (This causes no difficulty with positivity in the context of **URUE**, where the tensor product is different.)

In spite of its divergences from orthodoxy, **URUE** is in many respects a well-behaved probabilistic theory. In the next section, we shall improve on it, by considering a category of EJC-algebras having a slightly larger class of objects (in particular, it includes the quabit), but a slightly more restricted set of morphisms.

## 6.2 The Category InvQM

Recall that we write $\mathbf{M}^{\Phi}$ for the set of fixed-points of an involution $\Phi$ on a complex $*$-algebra $\mathbf{M}$. Notice that the involution $\Phi$ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with $R_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})^{\Phi}_{sa}$ (the transpose) and on $M_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$ with $Q_n = M_{2n}(\mathbb{C})^{\Phi}_{sa}$, namely $\Phi(a) = -JaJ$ where $J$ is the unitary $J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, are both unitary with respect to the trace inner product $\langle a, b \rangle := \mathrm{Tr}(ab^*)$[12]. The canonical involution on $C^*(C_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$, namely, the mapping $(a, b) \mapsto (b^T, a^T)$, is likewise unitary.

**Definition 6.13.** Call an EJC $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ *involutive* iff there exists a *unitary* involution $\Phi$ on $\mathbf{M}_A$ with $A = (\mathbf{M}_A)^{\Phi}_{sa}$. Let **InvQM** denote the category in which objects are involutive EJC-algebras, and in which a morphism $\phi : A \to B$ is a CP mapping $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ intertwining $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$, i.e, $\Phi_B \circ \phi = \phi \circ \Phi_A$.

[12] We follow the convention that inner products are linear in the *first* argument.

As pointed out earlier, the condition that $A$ be the set of self-adjoint fixed points of an involution makes $A$ reversible in $\mathbf{M}_A$. Thus, the class of involutive EJC-algebras contains no "higher" ($n = 4$ or $n > 5$) spin factors. In fact, it contains exactly direct sums of the universally embedded UR EJCs $(A, C^*(A))$ where $A = R_n, C_n$, with $n$ arbitrary, or $Q_n$ with $n > 2$, *together with* the *standardly* embedded quabit, i.e., $(Q_2, M_4(\mathbb{C}))$, with $Q_2$ the self-adjoint fixed points of the involution $\Phi(a) = -Ja^TJ$ discussed in Section 3.3. In other words, **InvQM** includes exclusively *quantum* systems over the three division rings $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{H}$, albeit with the complex systems represented in their universal embeddings. Note that $(\mathbb{R}, M_1(\mathbb{R}))$ counts as an involutive EJC: since $M_1(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$ is commutative, the identity map provides the necessary involution.

It is easy to see that CP mappings $\mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$ intertwining $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$ are automatically relatively CJP for the class of involutive EJCs. By 5.4 the canonical tensor product of involutive EJCs is again involutive, as

$$A \odot B = (\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B)_{sa}^{\Phi_A \otimes \Phi_B}$$

for all $A, B \in \mathbf{InvQM}$. Since invoutive EJCs are reversible, Proposition 5.3 implies that $A \odot B$ is a dynamical composite of $A$ and $B$. Composites and tensor products of intertwining CP maps are also such (as are associators, unit-introductions and the swap mapping), so **InvQM** is a symmetric monoidal category — indeed, a monoidal subcategory of the category of involutive EJC-algebras and relatively CJP maps[13].

In the special case in which $A$ and $B$ are universally embedded complex qantum systems, say $A = C_n$ and $B = C_k$, we have $\mathbf{M}_A = C^*(C_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and similarly $\mathbf{M}_B = M_k(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_k(\mathbb{C})$. The involutions $\Phi_A$ are given by $\Phi_A(a, b) = (b^T, a^T)$, and similarly for $\Phi_B$. In this case, the interwining CP-maps are sums of mappings of of the two forms: $(a, b) \mapsto (\phi(a), \phi^T(b))$ and $(a, b) \mapsto (\phi^T(b), \phi(a))$, where $\phi$ is a CP mapping $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \to M_k(\mathbb{C})$ and $\phi^T$ is determined by the condition $\phi^T(x^T) = (\phi(x))^T$, i.e. $\phi^T := T \circ \phi \circ T$.

Three special cases of **InvQM**-morphisms are worth emphasising:

**Corollary 6.14.** *Let $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ belong to* **InvQM**. *Then*

*(a) for every $a \in A$, the corresponding linear mapping $a : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbf{M}_A$ determined by $a(1) = a$, belongs to* $\mathbf{InvQM}(I, A)$*;*

*(b) every positive linear functional (in particular, every state) on $\mathbf{M}_A$ of the form $|a\rangle$, $a \in A_+$, belongs to* $\mathbf{InvQM}(A, I)$*;*

*Proof:* Part (a) is immediate from the fact that $a$ is fixed by $\Phi_A$; part (b) also follows from this, plus the unitarity of $\Phi_A$. □

The category **InvQM** provides a unification of finite-dimensional real, complex and quaternionic quantum mechanics, but with the same important caveats that

[13]We leave open the question of whether there exist relatively CJP mappings for the class of involutive EJC-algebras that are not intertwiners.

apply to **URUE**: the representation of orthodox, complex quantum systems $C_n$ in **InvQM** is through the universal embedding $\psi : C_n \mapsto C^*(C_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C}) \oplus M_n(\mathbb{C})$, $a \mapsto (a, a^T)$. As a consequence, the composite of two complex quantum systems in **InvQM** is a direct sum of two copies of the their standard composite — equivalently, is the standard composite, combined with a classical bit. Moreover, the mapping that swaps the direct summands of $C^*(C_n)$, a perfectly good morphism in **InvQM**, acts as the transpose on $\psi(a) = (a, a^T)$.

## 6.3 Compact Closure

A *compact structure* on a symmetric monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$ is a choice, for every object $A \in \mathcal{C}$, of a *dual object*: A triple $(A', \eta_A, f_A)$ consisting of an object $A' \in \mathbb{C}$, a *co-unit* $\eta_A : A \otimes A' \to I$ and a *unit* $f_A : I \to A' \otimes A$ such that

$$A \to A \otimes I \stackrel{\mathrm{id}_A \otimes f_A}{\longrightarrow} A \otimes (A' \otimes A) \longrightarrow (A \otimes A') \otimes A \stackrel{\eta_A \otimes \mathrm{id}_A}{\longrightarrow} I \otimes A \to A$$

and

$$A' \to I \otimes A' \stackrel{f_A \otimes \mathrm{id}_{A'}}{\longrightarrow} (A' \otimes A) \otimes A' \longrightarrow A' \otimes (A \otimes A') \stackrel{\mathrm{id}_{A'} \otimes \eta_A}{\longrightarrow} A' \otimes I \to A'$$

give the identity morphisms on $A$ and $A'$, respectively (and where the unlabeled arrows are the obvious unit introductions and associators).[14] The standard example is the category **FinVec** of finite-dimensional vector spaces (say, over $\mathbb{C}$) and linear mappings. Here there is a canonical linear functional $\eta_A : A \otimes A^* \to \mathbb{C}$, namely, the trace. A canonical unit is supplied by picking a basis $E$ for $A$, and setting $f_A = \sum_{x \in E} f_x \otimes f_x$, where $\{f_x\}$ is the dual basis for $A^*$; one then shows that this is independent of $E$, and that the identities above hold.

In [1], it is shown that a large number of information-processing protocols, including in particular conclusive teleportation and entanglement-swapping, hold in any compact closed symmetric monoidal category, if we interpret objects as systems and morphisms as physically allowed processes. In this section, we shall see that our category **InvQM** is compact closed. More exactly, we shall show that it inherits a compact structure from the natural compact structure on the category $*$**-Alg** of finite-dimensional complex $*$-algebras, which we now review.

If $\mathbf{M}$ is a finite-dimensional complex $*$-algebra, let Tr denote the canonical trace on $\mathbf{M}$, regarded as acting on itself by left multiplication (so that $\mathrm{Tr}(a) = \mathrm{tr}(L_a)$, $L_a : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbf{M}$ being $L_a(b) = ab$ for all $b \in \mathbf{M}$). This induces an inner product on $\mathbf{M}$, given by $\langle a, b \rangle_{\mathbf{M}} = \mathrm{Tr}(ab^*)$[15]. Note that this inner product is self-dualizing, i.e,. $a \in \mathbf{M}_+$ iff $\langle a, b \rangle \geq 0$ for all $b \in \mathbf{M}_+$.

[14] Our usage is slightly perverse. The usual convention is to denote the *unit* by $\eta_A$ and the co-unit by $\epsilon_A$. Our choice is motivated in part by the desire to represent states as morphisms $A \to I$ and effects as morphisms $I \to A$, rather than the reverse, together with the convention that takes the unit to correspond to the maximally entangled state.

[15] Again, we are following the convention that complex inner products are linear in the first argument.

Now let $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ be the conjugate algebra, writing $\overline{a}$ for $a \in \mathbf{M}$ when regarded as belonging to $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ (so that $\overline{ca} = \overline{c}\,\overline{a}$ for scalars $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\overline{a}\overline{b} = \overline{ab}$ for $a, b \in \mathbf{M}$). Note that $\langle \overline{a}, \overline{b} \rangle = \langle b, a \rangle$. Now define

$$f_{\mathbf{M}} = \sum_{e \in E} e \otimes \overline{e} \in \mathbf{M} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{M}}$$

where $E$ is any orthonormal basis for $\mathbf{M}$ with respect to $\langle \ | \ \rangle_{\mathbf{M}}$. Then straightforward computations show that $f_{\mathbf{M}} \in (\mathbf{M} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{M}})_+$, and that, for all $a, b \in \mathbf{M}$,

$$\langle a \otimes \overline{b}, f_{\mathbf{M}} \rangle = \langle a, b \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(ab^*),$$

where the inner product on the left is the trace inner product on $\mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{M}^*$. Now define $\eta_{\mathbf{M}} : \mathbf{M} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{M}} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $\eta_{\mathbf{M}} = |f_{\mathbf{M}}\rangle$, noting that this functional is positive (so, up to normalization, a state) since $f_{\mathbf{M}}$ is positive in $\mathbf{M} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{M}}$.

A final computation shows that, for any states $\alpha$ and $\overline{\alpha}$ on $\mathbf{M}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$, respectively, and any $a \in \mathbf{M}, \overline{a} \in \overline{\mathbf{M}}$, we have

$$(\eta_{\mathbf{M}} \otimes \alpha)(a \otimes f_{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}) = \alpha(a) \quad \text{and} \quad (\overline{\alpha} \otimes \eta_{\mathbf{M}})(f_{\overline{M}} \otimes \overline{a}) = \overline{\alpha}(\overline{a}).$$

Thus, $\eta_{\mathbf{M}}$ and $f_{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}$ define a compact structure on $*$-**Alg**, for which the dual object of $\mathbf{M}$ is given by $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$.

**Definition 6.15.** The *conjugate* of a EJC-algebra $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ is $(\overline{A}, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_A)$, where $\overline{A} = \{\overline{a} | a \in A\}$. We write $\eta_A$ for $\eta_{\mathbf{M}_A}$ and $f_A$ for $f_{\mathbf{M}_A}$.

Any linear mapping $\phi : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbf{N}$ between $*$-algebras $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$ gives rise to a linear mapping $\overline{\phi} : \overline{\mathbf{M}} \to \overline{\mathbf{N}}$, given by $\overline{\phi}(\overline{a}) = \overline{\phi(a)}$ for $a \in \mathbf{M}$. It is straightforward to show that if $\Phi$ is a unitary involution on $\mathbf{M}_A$ with $A = {\mathbf{M}_A}^{\Phi}_{sa}$, then $\overline{\Phi} : \overline{\mathbf{M}} \to \overline{\mathbf{M}}$ is also a unitary involution with $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{A_{sa}}^{\overline{\Phi}} = \overline{A}$. Thus, the class of involutive EJCs is closed under the formation of conjugates.

**Lemma 6.16.** *Let* $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ *belong to* **InvQM**. *Then* $f_A \in A \odot \overline{A}$.

*Proof:* By assumption, there is a unitary involution $\Phi$ on $\mathbf{M}_A$ such that $A = (\mathbf{M}_A)^{\Phi}_{sa}$; by Corollary 5.4, $A \odot \overline{A}$ is then the set of self-adjoint fixed points of $\Phi \otimes \overline{\Phi}$. Since $\Phi$ is unitary, if $E$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathbf{M}_A$, then so is $\{\Phi(e) | e \in E\}$; hence, as $f_A$ is independent of the choice of orthonormal basis, $f_A$ is invariant under $\Phi \otimes \overline{\Phi}$. Since $f_A$ is also self-adjoint, it belongs to $(\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_{\overline{A}})^{\Phi \otimes \overline{\Phi}}_{sa}$, i.e., to $A \odot \overline{A}$. $\square$

It follows now from part (b) of Corollary 6.14 that the functional

$$\eta_A = |f_{\overline{A}}\rangle : \mathbf{M}_{\overline{A}} \otimes \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbb{R}$$

is an **InvQM** morphism. Hence, **InvQM** inherits the compact structure from $*$-**Alg**, as promised. This gives us

**Theorem 6.17. InvQM** *is compact closed.*

**Dagger compactness** In fact, we can do a bit better. A *dagger* on a category $\mathcal{C}$ is an involutive contravariant functor $\dagger : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ that fixes objects; that is, $A^\dagger = A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{C}$, and $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{C}(B, A)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ with $f^{\dagger\dagger} = f$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a symmetric monoidal category and $(f \otimes g)^\dagger = f^\dagger \otimes g^\dagger$ for all morphisms $f$ and $g$, and also $\sigma^\dagger_{A,B} = \sigma_{B,A}$, where $\sigma_{A,B} : A \otimes B \to B \otimes A$ is the "swap" morphism, then $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be *dagger-monoidal.* Finally, if $\mathcal{C}$ has a compact structure such that $\eta^\dagger_A = f_A$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be *dagger-compact.*

It is not difficult to show that $*$**-Alg** is dagger-compact, where, if $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$ are finite-dimensional $*$-algebras and $\phi : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbf{N}$ is a linear mapping, $\phi^\dagger$ is the hermitian adjoint of $\phi$ with respect to the natural trace inner products on $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$. If $(A, \mathbf{M}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{M}_B)$ are involutive EJC-algebras with given unitary involutions $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$, then for any intertwiner $\phi : \mathbf{M}_A \to \mathbf{M}_B$, $\phi^\dagger$ also intertwines $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$. Hence, we have

**Corollary 6.18. InvQM** *is dagger-compact.*

# 7 Conclusion

We have found two categories of probabilistic models —the categories **RSE** and **InvQM**—that, in different ways, unify finite-dimensional real, complex and quaternionic quantum mechanics. In each case, there is a price to be paid for this unification. For **RSE**, this price is steep: **RSE** is a monoidal category, but one in which states (for instance) on complex systems don't count as physical processes. In particular, **RSE** is very far from being compact closed.[16]

In contrast, **InvQM** is clearly a well-behaved — indeed, dagger-compact — probabilistic theory, in which the states, as well as the effects, of real, complex, and quaternionic Euclidean Jordan algebras appear as morphisms. On the other hand, **InvQM** admits the transpose automorphism on the complex Hermitian Jordan algebra, and requires complex quantum systems to compose in a non-standard way. Nevertheless, by virtue of being dagger compact, **InvQM** continues to enjoy many of the information-processing properties of standard complex QM, e.g., the existence of conclusive teleportation and entanglement-swapping protocols [1]. Also, composites in **InvQM** satisfy the Cirel'son bound on correlations owing to the way that, by construction, these composites are embedded within a tensor product of complex matrix algebras.

All of this is in spite of the fact that composites in **InvQM** are not locally tomographic: the canonical composite $A \odot B$ is larger than the vector space tensor product $A \otimes B$. Local tomography is well known to separate complex QM from its real and

[16] In [10], we erroniously claimed that the category **URSE** of universally reversible, but standardly embedded, EJC algebras, with relatively CJP mappings, is compact closed. That this is not the case is clear from 6.3.

quaternionic variants, so its failure in **URUE** and **RSE** is hardly surprising, but it is noteworthy that we are able to construct (non-locally tomographic) composites in **URUE** in all of the non-real cases, and certain composites involving quaternions even in **RSE**. Even more interesting is the fact that, for quaternionic systems $A$ and $B$, the *information capacity* — the number of sharply distinguishable states — of $A \odot B$ is *larger* than the product of the capacities of $A$ and $B$. A related point is that, for quaternionc quantum systems $A$ and $B$, the product of a pure state of $A$ and a pure state of $B$ will generally be a *mixed* state in $A \odot B$.

The category **InvQM** contains interesting compact closed subcategories. In particular, real and quaternionic quantum systems, taken together, form a (full) monoidal sub-category of **InvQM** closed under composition. We conjecture that this is exactly what one gets by applying Selinger's CPM construction [36] to Baez' (implicit) category of pairs $(\mathbf{H}, J)$, $H$ a finite-dimensional Hilbert space and $J$ an anti-unitary with $J^2 = \pm 1$ [8].

Another compact-closed subcateory of **InvQM**, which we might call **InvCQM**, consists of universally embedded *complex* quantum systems $C_n$. It is interesting to note that, in an hypothetical universe described by **InvQM**, the subcategory **InvCQM** acts as a kind of "ideal", in that if $A \in \mathbf{InvQM}$ and $B \in \mathbf{InvCQM}$, then $A \odot B \in \mathbf{InvCQM}$ as well. This is provocative, as it suggests that such a universe, initially consisting of many systems of all three types, might eventually evolve into one in which complex systems greatly predominate.

Although it is not compact closed, the category **RSE** of reversible, standardly embedded EJCs remains of interest. This is still a monoidal category, and contains, in addition to real and quaternionic quantum systems, orthodox complex quantum systems in their standard embedding (and composing in the normal way). Indeed, these form a monoidal subcategory, $\mathbb{C}$QM, which, again, functions as an "ideal".

It is worth noting that the set of quaternionic quantum systems does *not* form a monoidal subcategory of either **RSE** or **InvQM**, as the composite of two quaternionic systems is *real*. Efforts to construct a free-standing quaternionic quantum theory have had to contend with the absence of a suitable *quaternionic* composite of quaternionic systems. For instance, as pointed out by Araki [6], the obvious candidate for the composite of $A = M_m(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$ and $B = M_n(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$, $M_{mn}(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$, does not have a large enough dimension to accommodate the real tensor product $A \otimes B$, causing difficulty for the representation of product effects.[17] In our approach, the issue simply doesn't arise. It seems that "quaternionic quantum mechanics" is best seen as an inextricable part of a larger theory. Essentially the same point has also been made by Baez [8].

The category **InvQM** is somewhat mysterious. It encompasses real and quaternionic QM in a completely natural way; however, while it also contains complex quantum systems, these compose in an exotic way: as pointed out above, the com-

[17] Attempts to interpret the quaternionic "Hilbert space" $\mathbb{H}^{mn}$ as a tensor product of $\mathbb{H}^m$ and $\mathbb{H}^n$ raise at least the possibility of signaling via the noncommutativity of scalar multiplication. This noncommutativity underlies the the argument in [33] that stronger-than-quantum correlations are achievable in such a model.

posite of two complex quantum systems in **InvQM** comes with an extra classical bit — equivalently, $\{0, 1\}$-valued superselection rule. This functions to make the transpose automorphism of $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ count as a morphism. The extra classical bit is flipped by the Jordan transpose (swap of $C^*$ summands) on either factor of such a composite, but unaffected if *both* parties implement the Jordan transpose (which does, of course, effect a Jordan transpose on the composite). The precise physical significance of this is a subject for further study.

As Example 6.2 shows, there is no way to enlarge **InvQM** so as to include higher spin factors, without either sacrificing compact closure (and even rendering the set $\mathcal{C}(A, I)$, which might naturally be thought to represent states, trivial) or venturing outside the ambient category of EJC-algebras, to make use of morphisms that are not (relatively) completely Jordan-preserving maps. Example 6.3 shows, more strikingly, that there is no way to construct a category of the form $\mathbf{CJP}_{\mathcal{C}}$ that contains *standardly embedded* complex quantum systems *and* real systems, without, again, sacrificing compact closure (indeed, the representation of states by morphisms).

# References


[1] S. Abramsky and B. Coecke. A categorical semantics of quantum protocols. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '04)*, pages 415–425, 2004.

[2] E. M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz. *State Spaces of Operator Algebras: Basic Theory, Orientations and $C^*$-products*. Birkhäuser, 2001.

[3] E. M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz. *Geometry of state spaces of operator algebras*. Birkhäuser, 2003.

[4] E. M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz. State spaces of jordan algebras. *Acta Mathematica*, 140:155–190, 2005.

[5] C. Aliprantis and R. Tourky. *Cones and Duality*. American Mathematical Society, 2007.

[6] H. Araki. On a characterization of the state space of quantum mechanics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 75:1–24, 1980.

[7] J. Baez. Quantum quandaries: a category-theoretic perspective. In S. French, D. Rickles, and J. Saatsi, editors, *Structural Foundations of Quantum Gravity*, pages 240–286. Oxford, 2006. Also: `quant-ph/0404040`.

[8] J. Baez. Division algebras and quantum theory. *Found. Phys.*, 42:819–855, 2012. Also: `arXiv:1101.5690`.

[9] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, M. Leifer, and A. Wilce. Cloning and broadcasting in generic probabilistic theories. `arxiv:quant-ph/0611295`, 2006.

[10] H. Barnum, M. A. Graydon, and A. Wilce. Some nearly quantum theories. In C. Heunen, P. Selinger, and J. Vicary, editors, *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science (Proceedings 12th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic)*, volume 195, pages 59–70, 2015. Also: `arXiv:1507.06278 [quant-ph]`.

[11] H. Barnum, M. Müller, and C. Ududec. Higher-order interference and single-system postulates characterizing quantum theory. *New J. Phys.*, 16:123029, 2014. Also: `arXiv:1403.4147`.

[12] H. Barnum and A. Wilce. Information processing in convex operational theories. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 270:3–15, 2011. Also: `arXiv:0908.2352`.

[13] H. Barnum and A. Wilce. Local tomography and the jordan structure of quantum theory. *Found. Phys.*, 44:192–212, 2014. Also: `arXiv:1202.4513`.

[14] H. Barnum and A. Wilce. Post-classical probability theory. In G. Chiribella and R. Spekkens, editors, *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils*, volume 181 of *Fundamental Theories of Physics*, pages 367–420. Springer, 2016. Also: `arXiv:1205.3833`.

[15] M. L. Curtis. *Matrix Groups*. Springer, 1984.

[16] E. B. Davies and J. T. Lewis. An operational approach to quantum probability. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 17:239–260, 1970.

[17] C. M. Edwards. The operational approach to algebraic quantum theory i. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 16:207–230, 1970.

[18] J. Faraut and A. Koranyi. *Analysis on Symmetric Cones*. Oxford University Press, 1994.

[19] M. A. Graydon. Quaternions and quantum theory. Master's thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada, 2011.

[20] M. A. Graydon. PhD thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada, Forthcoming.

[21] H. Hanche-Olsen. On the structure and tensor products of jc-algebras. *Can. J. Math.*, 35:1059–1074, 1983.

[22] H. Hanche-Olsen and E. Størmer. *Jordan Operator Algebras*. Pitman, 1984.

[23] L. Hardy and W. Wootters. Limited holism and real-vector-space quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics*, 42:1–20, 212.

[24] A. Holevo. *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Mechanics*. North-Holland, 1982.

[25] K. N. Hoffmann J. Hilgert and J. Lawson. *Lie Groups, Convex Cones and Semigroups*. Oxford, 1989.

[26] F. B. Jamjoom. On the tensor products of jw-algebras. *Can. J. Math.*, 47:786–800, 1995.

[27] P. Jordan. Über ein klasse nichtassoziativer hypercomplexe algebren. *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math. Phys. Kl. I.*, 33:569–575, 1933.

[28] P. Jordan, J. von Neumann, and E. Wigner. On an algebraic generalization of the quantum mechanical formalism. *Annals of Math.*, 35:29–64, 1934.

[29] M. Koecher. Positivitatsbereiche im $r^n$. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 97:575–596, 1957.

[30] M. Koecher. *The Minnesota Notes on Jordan Algebras and Their Applications*, volume 1710 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 1999. Original edition: Jordan Algebras and their Applications, School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota, 1962.

[31] G. Ludwig. Versuch einer axiomatischen grundlegung der quantenmechanik und allgemeinerer physikalischer theorien. *Zeitschrift fur Physik*, 181:233–260, 1964.

[32] G. Ludwig. *Deutung des Begriffs "physikalische Theorie" und axiomatische Grundlegung der Hilbertraumstruktur der Quantenmechanik durch Hauptstze des Messens*, volume 4 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*. Springer, 1970.

[33] M. McKague. Quaternionic quantum mechanics allows non-local boxes. `arxiv:0911.1761`, 2009.

[34] M. Müller and C. Ududec. The structure of reversible computation determines the self-duality of quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:130401, 2012.

[35] I. Satake. *Algebraic structures of symmetric domains*, volume 14 of *Publications of the Mathematical Society of Japans*. Iwanami Shoten and Princeton University Press, 1980.

[36] P. Selinger. Dagger compact closed categories and completely positive maps (extended abstract). In *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science (Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Quantum Programming Languages (QPL 2005))*, volume 170, pages 139–163. Elsevier, 2007.

[37] D. Topping. Jordan algebras of self-adjoint operators. *Am. Math. Soc. Memoirs*, 53, 1965.

[38] H. Upmeier. Derivations of jordan $c^*$-algebras. *Math. Scand.*, 46:251–264, 1980.

[39] E. Vinberg. Homogeneous cones. *Dokl. Acad. Nauk. SSSR*, 133:9–12, 1960. English translation: E. Vinberg (1961): Soviet Math. Dokl. 1, pp. 787-790.

[40] A. Wilce. Conjugates, filters and quantum mechanics. `arXiv:1206.2897 [quant-ph]`, 2012.

[41] A. Wilce. Four and a half axioms for quantum mechanics. In Y. Ben-Menahem and M. Hemmo, editors, *Probability in Physics*. Springer, 2012.

[42] A. Wilce. Symmetry and self-duality in categories of probabilistic models. In B. Jacobs, P. Selinger, and B. Spitters, editors, *Proceedings of QPL 2011*, volume 95 of *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 275–279, 2012.

# A Direct Sums of EJAs

The first part of this Appendix collects some basic facts about direct sums of EJAs that are used in the body of the paper. The second part contains a proof that $C^*(A \oplus B) = C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$, and that the direct sum of universally reversible EJAs is again UR.

**Direct Summands and Central Projections** The *direct sum* of EJAs $A$ and $B$ is $A \oplus B := A \times B$, equipped with the slotwise operations, so that the canonical projections $\pi_1 : A \times B \to A$ and $\pi_2 : A \times B \to B$ are unital Jordan homomorphisms. Identifying $A$ and $B$ with $A \times \{0\}$ and $\{0\} \times B$, respectively, we write $a + b$ for $(a, 0) + (0, b)$. Note that $A$ and $B$ are then ideals in $A \oplus B$, and that $B = A^\perp := \{z \in A \oplus B | \langle a, z\rangle = 0 \ \forall a \in A\}$. Conversely, it's easy to check that if $E$ is an EJA and $A$ is an ideal in $A$, then $A^\perp$ is also an ideal, and $ab = 0$ for all $a \in A, b \in A^\perp$; hence, $E \simeq A \oplus A^\perp$.

Suppose $E$ is an EJA and $A \leq E$ is an ideal: let $B = A^\perp$. Then for all $z \in E$,

$$\langle a, zb\rangle = \langle az, b\rangle = 0$$

since $az \in A$. Thus, $B$ is also an ideal, and $E = A \oplus B$ as a vector space. Finally, if $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, then $ab \in A \cap B = \{0\}$. Hence, if $a, x \in A$ and $b, y \in B$ then $(a+b)(x+y) = ax+by$, i.e., in the representation of $A \oplus B$ as $A \times B$, operations are slotwise. What is not entirely obvious is that $A$ contains a unit element.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let $A$ be an ideal in an EJA $E$. Then there exists a projection $p \in E$ such that $pa = a$ for every $a \in A$. Thus, $A = pA$, and $E = pA \oplus p'A$, where $p' = 1 - p$.*

For a proof in the more general setting of JBW algebras, see [3], Propositions 2.7, 2.39 and 2.41.

The *center* of an EJA $E$ is the set of elements operator-commuting with all other elements. Denote this by $C(E)$ If $E = A \oplus B$, and $p$ is the unit of $A$, so that $A = pA$,

then it's easy to check that $p \in C(E)$. Conversely, if $p$ is a central projection, then $pA$ is an ideal, with unit element $p$. If $p$ is a *minimal* central projection, then $pA$ is a minimal direct summand of $E$. If $E$ is simple, then its only central projections are 0 and 1, and conversely.

One can show that for every projection $e$ in an EJA $E$, there exists a unique miniml projection $c(e) \in C(E)$, the *central cover* of $p$, such that $e \leq c(e)$. Then $A := c(p)E$ is an ideal of $E$, in which $c(p)$ is the unit. If $A$ is a minimal ideal, then elements of $A$ are exactly those with central cover $c(p)$. [[3], 2.37, 2.39]. More generally, two elements of $E$ having the same central cover have nonzero components in exactly the same ideals of $E$.

Recall that a *symmetry* of $A$ is an element $s \in A$ with $s^2 = u$. Projections $e, f$ in $A$ are *exchanged by a symmetry* $s$ iff $U_s(e) = f$. If there exists a sequence of symmetries $s_1, ..., s_n$ with $U_{s_n} \circ \cdots \circ U_{s_1}(e) = f$, then $e$ and $f$ are *equivalent*.

**Lemma A.2** ([3], Lemma 3.9)**.** *Equivalent projections have the same central cover.*

**The universal $C^*$-algebra of a direct sum** Recall that a sequence of vector spaces and linear maps, or of Jordan algebras and Jordan homomorphisms, or of $C^*$ algebras and $*$-homomorphisms

$$A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C$$

is said to be *exact at* $B$ iff the image of $\alpha$ is the kernel of $\beta$. A *short exact sequence* is one of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \longrightarrow 0$$

that is exact at $A$, $B$ and $C$ (with the maps on the ends being the only possible ones). This means that $\alpha$ is injective (its kernel is 0), while $\beta$ is surjective (its image is the kernel of the zero map, i.e., all of $C$).

Let **EJA** and **Cstar** be the categories of EJAs and Jordan homomorphisms, and of $C^*$-algebras and $*$-homomorphisms, respectively.

**Theorem A.3** ([21])**.** *$A \mapsto C^*(A)$ is an exact functor from* **EJA** *to* **Cstar**. *In other words, if $A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C$ is an exact sequence in* **EJA**, *then $C^*(A) \xrightarrow{C^*(\alpha)} B \xrightarrow{C^*(\beta)} C^*(C)$ is an exact sequence in* **Cstar**.

We are going to use this to show that $C^*(A \oplus B) = C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$. We need some preliminaries. The following is standard:

**Lemma A.4.** *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} C \xrightarrow{\beta} B \longrightarrow 0$$

*be a short exact sequence of vector spaces. Then the following are equivalent:*

*(a) There is an isomorphism $\phi : A \oplus B \simeq C$ such that $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are respectively the canonical injection and surjection given by*

$$\alpha(a) = \phi(a, 0) \quad \textit{and} \quad \beta(\phi(a, b)) = b$$

*(b) The sequence is* split *at $B$: there exists a linear mapping $\gamma : B \to C$ such that $\beta \circ \gamma = id_B$.*

The idea is that, given $\phi$, we can define $\gamma$ by $\gamma(b) = \phi(0, b)$ and, given $\gamma$, we can define $\phi$ by $\phi(a, b) = \alpha(a) + \gamma(b)$.

If $A$, $B$ and $C$ are Jordan algebras or $C^*$ algebras, the implication from (a) to (b) is obviously valid, but the converse requires additional assumptions.

**Lemma A.5.** *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} C \xrightarrow{\beta} B \longrightarrow 0.$$

*be a short exact sequence of $*$-algebras and $*$-homomorphisms, split by a $*$-homomorphism $\gamma : B \to C$ with $\beta \circ \gamma = id_B$. Let $\phi : A \oplus B \to C$ be as defined above, i.e, $\phi(a, b) = \alpha(a) + \gamma(b)$ for $a \in A$, $b \in B$. Then the following are equivalent:*

*(a) $\gamma(B)$ is a (2-sided) $*$-ideal in $C$;*

*(b) $\phi$ is multiplicative, and thus a $*$-isomorphism;*

*(c) There exists a $*$-homomorphism $\delta : C \to A$ with*

$$0 \longleftarrow A \xleftarrow{\delta} C \xleftarrow{\gamma} B \longleftarrow 0$$

*exact.*

*Proof:* (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). It is easy to see that a $C^*$-algebra $C$ is the direct sum of two $*$-ideals $A, B \leq C$ iff $A + B = C$ and $A \cap C = \{0\}$, i.e., iff $C$ is the vector-space direct sum of $A$ and $B$. We already know that $\alpha(A) + \beta(B) = C$ (since $\phi$ is a linear isomorphism). It therefore suffices to show that $\alpha(A)$ and $\gamma(B)$ are $*$-ideals with zero intersection. We are assuming that $\gamma(B)$ is a $*$ ideal. As it's the kernel of a $*$-homomorphism, $\alpha(A)$ is automatically a $*$-ideal. To see that $\alpha(A) \cap \gamma(C) = \{0\}$, let $c \in C$ with $c = \alpha(a) = \gamma(b)$ for some $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. Then we have

$$b = \beta(\gamma(b)) = \beta(\alpha(a)) = 0$$

whence, $c = \gamma(0) = 0$.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c). If $\phi$ is a $*$-isomorphism, then let $\delta = \pi_A \circ \phi^{-1}$ where $\pi_A : A \oplus B \to A$ is the projection $\pi_A(a, b) = a$. Note that $\delta$ is the composition of two $*$-homomorphisms, and thus, a $*$-homomorphism. To verify exactness, note that as $\phi(a, b) = \alpha(a) + \gamma(b)$, we have $\phi(0, b) = \gamma(b)$, whence, $\phi^{-1}(\gamma(b)) = (0, b)$. Thus, $\delta(\gamma(b)) = \pi_A(0, b) = 0$.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a). By exactness, $\gamma(C)$ is the kernel of the $*$-homomorphism $\delta$, and hence, a $*$-ideal. $\square$

Now let $E = A \oplus B$. Then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{j} A \oplus B \xrightarrow{p} B \longrightarrow 0.$$

where $j(a) = (a, 0)$ and $p(a, b) = b$. This is split by the homomorphism $k : A \to A \oplus B$ given by $k(b) = (0, b)$. Hanche-Olsen's exactness theorem (2.1) gives us a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C^*(A) \stackrel{C^*(j)}{\longrightarrow} C^*(A \oplus B) \stackrel{C^*(p)}{\longrightarrow} C^*(B) \longrightarrow 0.$$

By functoriality, $C^*(p) \circ C^*(j) = \mathrm{id}_{C^*(B)}$, so this is again split. Thus, *regarded as a vector space*, $C^*(A \oplus B)$ is canonically isomorphic to $C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$. On the other hand, we *also* have an exact sequence

$$0 \longleftarrow A \stackrel{q}{\longleftarrow} A \oplus B \stackrel{k}{\longleftarrow} B \longleftarrow 0$$

where $q(a, b) = a$. By the same argument, then, we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longleftarrow C^*(A) \stackrel{C^*(q)}{\longleftarrow} C^*(A \oplus B) \stackrel{C^*(k)}{\longleftarrow} C^*(B) \longleftarrow 0.$$

Applying the preceding Lemma, we have

**Proposition A.6.** *If $A$ and $B$ are EJAs, then*

$$C^*(A \oplus B) \simeq C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B).$$

Notice that if $\Phi_A$ and $\Phi_B$ are, respectively, the canonical involutions on $C^*(A)$ and $C^*(B)$ fixing points of $A$ and $B$, then $\Phi_A \oplus \Phi_B$ is a $*$-involution on $C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$ fixing points of $A \oplus B$. But there is only one such $*$-involution on $C^*(A \oplus B)$, the canonical one. In other words, in identifying $C^*(A \oplus B)$ with $C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$, we also identify $\Phi_{A \oplus B}$ with $\Phi_A \oplus \Phi_B$.

Recalling now the fact ([21], Lemma 4.2) that an EJA $A$ is universally reversible (UR) iff $A$ coincides with the set of self-adjoint fixed points in $C^*(A)$ of the canonical $*$-involution $\Phi_A$, we have the

**Corollary A.7.** *If $A$ and $B$ are UR, then so is $A \oplus B$.*

*Proof:* Let $\Phi = \Phi_A \oplus \Phi_B$ be the canonical involution on $C^*(A \oplus B) = C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$. For $(a, b) \in C^*(A) \oplus C^*(B)$, we have $\Phi(a, b) = (\Phi_A(a), \Phi_B(b)) = (a, b)$ iff $\Phi_A(a) = a$ and $\Phi_B(b) = b$. Since $A$ and $B$ are UR, this holds iff $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, i.e., iff $(a, b) \in A \oplus B$. Thus, $A \oplus B$ is exactly the set of fixed-points of $\Phi$, and so, is UR. $\square$

# B The Quabit

In this appendix, we show that the standard tensor product $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ of two quabits is $R_{16}$, the self-adjoint part of the real matrix algebra $M_16(\mathbb{R})$.

**The symplectic representation** A quaternion $q = a + bi + cj + dk$ can alternatively be expressed in the form $(a + bi) + (c + di)j$, i.e., $z + wj$ where $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$, and also has a standard representation as a $2 \times 2$ complex matrix, namely

$$[q] := \begin{bmatrix} z & w \\ -\overline{w} & \overline{z} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Treating $\mathbb{H}$ as a $*$-algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, the mapping $q \mapsto [q]$ is a $*$-homomorphism from $\mathbb{H}$ into $M_2(\mathbb{C})$. This gives us a natural representation — that is, $*$-homomorphism — $\pi_o : M_n(\mathbb{H}) \to M_n(M_2(\mathbb{C})) \simeq M_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$, namely,

$$\pi_o(a)_{p,q} = [a_{p,q}]$$

for $a \in M_n(\mathbb{H})$ and $p, q = 1, ..., n$. An equivalent, but for our purposes, more useful, representation is given by

$$\pi(a) = F\pi_o(a)F$$

where $F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. This is called the *symplectic* representation of $M_n(\mathbb{H})$.

If we express each entry of $a$ in the form $a_{p,q} = z_{p,q} + w_{p,q}j$, then $a = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 j$ where $(\Gamma_1)_{p,q} = z_{p,q}$ and $(\Gamma_2)_{p,q} = w_{p,q}$. Computing, one finds that

$$\pi(a) = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_1 & \Gamma_2 \\ -\overline{\Gamma}_2 & \overline{\Gamma}_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that $\pi(a)$ is self-adjoint iff $\Gamma_1$ is self-adjoint and $\Gamma_2$ is anti-symmetric, and that this is the case iff $a$ is self-adjoint in $M_2(\mathbb{H})$.

From now on, we identify $Q_2$ with $\pi(M_2(\mathbb{H})_{sa}) \leq M_4(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$. Regarded as an embedded EJA in this way, the standard tensor product $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ is defined to be the Jordan subalgebra of $M_4(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_4(\mathbb{C}) = M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$ generated by $Q_2 \odot Q_2$. Our main goal in this Appendix is to prove

**Proposition B.1.** $C^*(Q_2 \odot Q_2) \simeq M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$.

Since $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ is UR, this will follow from ([21], Theorem 4.4) if we can show that (i) $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ generates $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$ as a $*$-algebra, and (ii) there is a $*$-involution on $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$ fixing elements of $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ pointwise.

**Quaternionic Pauli Matrices** In order to show that $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ generates $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$, We begin by writing down some useful elements of $Q_2$. The analogues of the Pauli matrices $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$ are the following *quaternionic Pauli matrices*:

$$\sigma_o = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \sigma_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -j \\ j & 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \sigma_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -k \\ k & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Evidently, $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_3$ are the standard Pauli matrices $\sigma_z$, $\sigma_x$ and $\sigma_y$, respectively. Note that these are all traceless and self-adjoint. Applying the representation $\pi$ gives

us six elements of $Q_2$, $s_o = \pi(\sigma_o)$, $s_1 = \pi(\sigma_1)$, ..., $s_5 = \pi(\sigma_5)$. Direct computation reveals that

$$s_o = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \qquad s_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_z & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_z \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_z \qquad s_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_x & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_x \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_x$$

$$s_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_y & 0 \\ 0 & -\sigma_y \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y \qquad s_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i\sigma_y \\ i\sigma_y & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \qquad s_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sigma_y \\ \sigma_y & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x$$

These again obey the Pauli-like identities above. Using these, we can compute (associative) products of these matrices, e.g.,

$$s_3 s_4 = (\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y)(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) = \sigma_z\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y\sigma_y = -i\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_o.$$

**Lemma B.2.** *$Q_2 \otimes Q_2$ generates $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$ as a $*$-algebra.*

*Proof:* Begin by noting that the elements

$$\sigma_a \otimes \sigma_b \otimes \sigma_c \otimes \sigma_c,$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \{0, x, y, z\}$, are a basis for $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$. For each $a \in \{0, x, y, z\}$, let

$$x_1(a) = \sigma_a \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o$$

$$x_2(a) = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_a \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o$$

$$x_3(a) = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_a \otimes \sigma_o$$

$$x_4(a) = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_a$$

Then $x_1(a)x_2(b)x_3(c)x_4(d) = \sigma_a \otimes \sigma_b \otimes \sigma_c \otimes \sigma_d$. These last form a basis for $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$, so it will suffice to show that, for $a \in \{x, y, z\}$, the elements $x_p(a)$ can be manufactured from elements of $Q_2 \otimes Q_2$ by forming (associative) products.

For a start, notice that

$$s_1 \otimes s_o = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o = x_2(z) \quad \text{and} \quad s_o \otimes s_1 = \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_z = x_4(z).$$

Similarly, with $s_2$ in place of $s_1$, we have $x_2(x)$ and $x_4(x)$ in $Q_2 \odot Q_2$.

As noted above, $s_3 s_4 = -i\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_o$. Similarly,

$$s_3 s_5 = i\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_o \text{ and } s_4 s_5 = -i\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_o.$$

Hence,

$$(s_3 \otimes s_4)(s_4 \otimes s_4) = s_3 s_4 \otimes s_4 s_4 = -i\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o = -ix_1(y)$$

and similarly

$$((s_3 \otimes s_5)(s_5 \otimes s_5) = ix_1(y) \quad \text{and} \quad (s_4 \otimes s_5)(s_5 \otimes s_5) = -ix_1(z).$$

Thus, we have $x_1(a)$ for all $a$. In an entirely similar way, we find that considering

$$(s_3 \otimes s_3)(s_3 \otimes s_4) = -ix_3(y),\ (s_3 \otimes s_3)(s_3 \otimes s_5) = ix_3(x),\ (s_4 \otimes s_4)(s_4 \otimes s_5) = -ix_3(z).$$

So we have $x_3(a) \in (Q_2 \odot Q_2)^2$ for all $a$.

It remains to obtain $x_2(y)$ and $x_4(y)$. But now we have

$$(s_3 \otimes s_o)x_1(z) = (\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y\sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o)(\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o \otimes \sigma_o) = x_2(y)$$

and similarly

$$x_3(z)(s_o \otimes s_3) = x_3(y).$$

Hence, $x_2(y)$ and $x_4(y)$ also belong to $(Q_2 \odot Q_2)^2$, completing the proof. $\square$

**An Involution** We now wish to find an involution on $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$ fixing $Q_2 \odot Q_2$ pointwise. If $\phi : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbf{M}$ is a $*$-involution on a complex $*$-algebra $\mathbf{M}$, recall that we write $\mathbf{M}^\phi_{sa}$ for the set of self-adjoint fixed-points of $\phi$. In finite dimensions, this is always an EJA. Suppose $\phi$ and $\psi$ are $*$-involutions on complex $*$-algebras $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$, respectively: if $A$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $\mathbf{M}^\phi_{sa}$ and $B$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $\mathbf{N}^\psi_{sa}$, then it's easy to see that $A \odot B$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $(\mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{N})^{\phi\otimes\psi}_{sa}$.

Let $J = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$. Then

$$\phi(a) := -Ja^TJ = -(JaJ)^T$$

is a $*$-involution (a $*$-antiautomorphism of period two) on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. This fixes $Q_2$ pointwise, i.e., $\phi(\pi(a)) = \pi(a)$ for every $a \in M_2(\mathbb{H})_{sa}$. Identifying $M_{16}(\mathbb{C})$ with $M_4(M_4(\mathbb{C})) = M_4(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_4(\mathbb{C})$, we then have an involution

$$\Phi = \phi \otimes \phi : M_{16}(\mathbb{C}) \to M_{16}(\mathbb{C}).$$

By the comments above, we have

**Lemma B.3.** *$\Phi = \phi \otimes \phi$ fixes every element of $Q_2 \odot Q_2$.*

This completes the proof of Proposition 1. Moreover, as a consequence of ([21] Theorem 4.4), we have

**Corollary B.4.** *$Q_2 \odot Q_2 = M_{16}(\mathbb{C})^\Phi$.*

Since $C^*(A) \simeq \mathbf{M} \simeq C^*(B)$ (as $*$-algebras with involution) implies $A \simeq \mathbf{M}^\phi_{sa} \simeq B$, and since $M_{16}(\mathbb{C}) \simeq C^*(M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa})$, we have

**Corollary B.5.** *$Q_2 \odot Q_2 = M_{16}(\mathbb{R})_{sa} =: R_{16}$.*

# C Spin factors

The Jordan-von Neumann-Wigner Classification Theorem [28] singles out exactly three classes of finite dimensional simple euclidean Jordan algebras: the matrix algebras $R_n, C_n, Q_n$, the exceptional Jordan algebra $M_3(\mathbb{O})_{\text{sa}}$, and one further type. The remaining type were dubbed *Spin Factors* by Topping in [37]. For each finite $\mathbb{N} \ni n > 1$, there exists a unique spin factor of dimension $1+n$ (up to Jordan isomorphism [22]) denoted by $V_n$. Abstractly, $V_n$ is generated as a Jordan algebra by a *spin system* of cardinality $n$: a collection of $2 \leq n \in \mathbf{N}$ symmetries (*i.e.* self-adjoint unitaries) $s_p$ in a unital JB algebra $\mathcal{A}$, with $s_p \neq \pm u_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $s_p \bullet s_q = u_{\mathcal{A}}\delta_{p,q}$. It follows that $V_n \cong \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^n$ as a real inner product space; moreover as a euclidean Jordan algebra with

$$\left(\lambda_0 \oplus \vec{\lambda}\right) \bullet \left(\mu_0 \oplus \vec{\mu}\right) = \lambda_0\mu_0 + \langle \vec{\lambda}, \vec{\mu} \rangle \oplus \lambda_0\vec{\mu} + \mu_0\vec{\lambda}. \tag{1}$$

Concretely, the usual complex Pauli matrices can be used to define the spin factors. We recall the usual complex Pauli matrices as follows

$$u_{\mathcal{C}_2} = \sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

Following [22], we define for each finite $\mathbb{N} \ni n > 1$ and $\forall 1 \leq p \leq n$, with $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ the usual floor and ceiling functions

$$t_p = \begin{cases} \begin{cases} \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil - 1}} \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil}} & p \text{ odd} \\ \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil - 1}} \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil}} & p \text{ even} \end{cases} & n \text{ even} \\ \begin{cases} \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil - 1}} \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil}} & p \text{ odd} \\ \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil - 1}} \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil}} & p \text{ even} \end{cases} & n \text{ odd} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where our notation is such that $x^{\otimes^0} = 1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \otimes 1 = x = x^{\otimes^1}$, $x^{\otimes^2} = x \otimes x$, and so on. One can easily check that for each $n > 1$, $\{t_1, \ldots, t_n\}$ generates a spin factor of dimension $1+n$ with $t_p \bullet t_q = (t_p t_q + t_q t_p)/2$. It turns out [21], with finite $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that the maps

$$\psi_{2k} : V_{2k} \longrightarrow M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}} :: s_p \longmapsto t_p \tag{4}$$

$$\psi_{2k+1} : V_{2k+1} \longrightarrow M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}} \oplus M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}} :: s_p \longmapsto t_p \tag{5}$$

are precisely the canonical injections of $V_n$ into their universal C*-algebras (*i.e.* their *universal* representations). Our *standard* representation $\pi_n$ of $V_n$ differs from the universal representation when $n$ is odd. Specifically, when $n$ is even we define $v_p = t_p$, and when $n$ is odd we define $\forall 1 \leq p < n$

$$v_p = \begin{cases} \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil - 1}} \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil}} & p \text{ odd} \\ \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil - 1}} \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil}} & p \text{ even} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

$$v_n = \sigma_3^{\otimes^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}} \tag{7}$$

and we embed $V_n$ into its *standard* C*-algebra via the following Jordan monomorphism with $v_p \bullet v_q = (v_p v_q + v_q v_p)/2$

$$\pi_n : V_n \longrightarrow M_2(\mathbb{C})_{\mathrm{sa}}^{\otimes \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} :: s_p \longmapsto v_p. \tag{8}$$

For example, the universal and standard representations for the qubit — *i.e.* $V_3$ — differ as follows

$$t_1 = \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_0 \qquad v_1 = \sigma_1 \tag{9}$$
$$t_2 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \qquad v_2 = \sigma_2 \tag{10}$$
$$t_3 = \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_1 \qquad v_3 = \sigma_3 \tag{11}$$

hence the name *standard* representation. Incidentally, note that $V_3 \cong C_2$ as a euclidean Jordan algebra. Furthermore, $V_2 \cong R_2$, $V_5 \cong Q_2$, and $V_9 \cong M_2(\mathbb{O})_{\mathrm{sa}}$; the ambient spaces for the real, quaternionic, and octonionic quantum bits.

# D The inner product on a composite

In this appendix, we prove Proposition 4.3, which, for convenience, we restate:

**Proposition D.1.** *Let $AB$ be a composite of EJAs $A$ and $B$. Then for all $a, x \in A$ and all $b, y \in B$,*

$$\langle a \odot x, b \odot y \rangle = \langle a, x \rangle \langle b, y \rangle.$$

*Proof:* We begin with the case in which $a$ and $b$ are minimal projections. Since $a \odot b$ is then also a projection, the discussion in Section 3.2 tells us that

$$\widehat{a \odot b} = \|a \odot b\|^{-2} (a \odot b)$$

defines a state. Now define a positive bilinear form $\omega : A \times B \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$\omega(x, y) = \langle \widehat{a \odot b}, x \odot y \rangle = \langle a \odot b, x \odot y \rangle$$

for all $x \in A$, $y \in B$. Note that $\omega$ is normalized, i.e., a state in the maximal tensor product $A \otimes B$. Now evaluate the first marginal of $\omega$ at $a$:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1(a) = \omega(a \otimes u_B) &= \langle \widehat{a \odot b}, a \otimes u_B \rangle \\ &= \langle \widehat{a \odot b}, a \odot b + a \odot b' \rangle \\ &= (\langle \widehat{a \odot b}, a \odot b \rangle + \langle \widehat{a \odot b}, a \odot b' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle \widehat{a \odot b}, a \odot b \rangle = 1$, the secondond summand at the end is 0, and we have $\omega_1(a) = 1$. Since $a$ is minimal, there is only one such state: $\omega_1(a) = \langle \widehat{a}|$, i.e., the functional $b \mapsto \langle a, b \rangle$. Moreover, this is a *pure* state. The same argument shows that $\omega_2(b) = 1$, so that $\omega_2 = \langle \widehat{b}|$. As is well known, if a non-signaling state has pure

marginals, then it's the product of these marginals [9]. Thus, $\omega = \langle\widehat{a}| \otimes \langle\widehat{b}|$. This gives us

$$\langle a \odot b, x \odot y\rangle = c\langle a, x\rangle\langle b, y\rangle.$$

where $c := \frac{\|a\odot b\|^2}{\|a\|^2\|b\|^2}$.

We want to show that $c = 1$. As a first step, note that $c$ is independent of the choice of minimal projections $a$ and $b$ (Argue by symmetry: since $A$ and $B$ are simple, there are symmetries $\phi$ and $\psi$ taking any given pair $a, b$ to any other such pair $a', b'$; hence, there's a symmetry taking $a \odot b$ to $a' \odot b'$ 4.8. This is the only use we make of condition (c) above.) Extend $a$ and $b$ to orthogonal decompositions of $u_A$ and $u_B$ as sums of projections: $u_A = \sum_{a_i} a_i$ with $a = a_1$, and $u_B = \sum_j b_j$ with $b = b_1$ Then we have $u_{AB} = \sum_{i,j} a_i \odot b_j$, so

$$\sum_{i,j,k,l} \langle a_i \odot b_j, a_k \odot b_l\rangle = \langle u_{AB}, u_{AB}\rangle = 1$$

but also, noting that all $a_i$ and $b_j$ here are minimal projections, so that the constant $c$ above is the same for all choices of $a_i \odot b_j$,

$$\sum_{i,j,k,l} \langle a_i \odot b_j, a_i \odot b_l\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k,l} c\langle a_i \odot b_j, a_k \odot b_l\rangle = c.$$

Hence, $c = 1$.

Now suppose $a$ and $b$ are arbitrary elements of $A$ and $B$, respectively. Spectrally decomposing $a$ and $b$ as

$$a \;=\; \sum_i t_i a_i \text{ and } b \;=\; \sum_j s_j b_j$$

where $a_i$ and $b_j$ are pairwise orthogonal families of minimal projections, we have

$$\langle a \odot b| = \langle \sum_{i,j} t_i s_j a_i \odot b_j| = \sum_{i,j} t_i s_j \langle a_i \odot b_j|.$$

Hence, for all $x, y$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle a \odot b, x \odot y\rangle &= \sum_{i,j} t_i s_j \langle a_i \odot b_j, x \odot y\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j} t_i s_j \langle a_i|x\rangle\langle b_j, y\rangle \\ &= \langle a, x\rangle\langle b, y\rangle\end{aligned}$$

as advertised. □

# E Weak Composites

By a *weak composite* of EJAs $A$ and $B$, we mean an EJA $AB$ and a bilinear mapping $\pi : A \otimes B \to AB$ satisfying parts (a) and (b), but not necessarily part (c), of Definition 4.1. That is, we suspend the requirement that $AB$ be generated, as a Jordan algebra, by $\pi(A \otimes B)$. We are going to show that the Jordan subalgebra of $AB$ generated by the image of $A \otimes B$ in $AB$ also satisfies these conditions, and hence, is a composite in the strict sense.

Observe, first, that we made no use of Condition (c) in proving any of the results leading up to, and including, Corollary 4.7. So all of these are also satisfied by weak composites.

**Proposition E.1.** *Let $AB$ be a weak composite of EJAs $A$ and $B$. Then the Jordan subalgebra of $AB$ generated by $A \otimes B$ is also a composite.*

*Proof:* Identifying $A \otimes B$ with its image, $\pi(A \otimes B)$, in $AB$, let $A \odot B = J(A \otimes B)$ denote the Jordan subalgebra of $AB$ generated by $A \otimes B$. That the co-restriction $\pi : A \otimes B \to A \odot B$ satisfies the conditions for a composite (Definition 2.1) is straightfoward. It is also straightforward that $A \odot B$ will satisfy the conditions for a composite of Jordan models (Definition 4.1, *provided* that it satisfies the conditions for a dynamical composite (Definition 2.3. To see that it does, let $\phi \in G(A)$ and $\psi \in G(B)$. We need to show that $\phi \otimes \psi$ preserves $A \odot B$. We can expand $\phi$ as $U_a \circ g$ and $\psi$ as $U_b \circ h$ for some interior elements $a \in A_+$, $b \in B_+$, and Jordan homomorphisms $g \in G(A)$ and $h \in G(B)$ ([18], III.5.1). Now

$$\phi \otimes \psi = (U_a \circ g) \otimes (U_b \circ h) = (U_a \otimes U_b) \circ (g \otimes h).$$

Since $(g \otimes h)(u_{AB}) = g(u_A) \otimes h(u_B) = u_A \otimes u_B = u_{AB}$, $g \otimes h$ is a symmetry, hence, a Jordan automorphism of $AB$ ([3], Theorem 2.8). As it maps $A \otimes B$ to itself, it also preserves $J(A \otimes B)$, i.e., $A \odot B$.

It remains to show that $U_a \otimes U_b$ also preserves $A \odot B$. Begin with the observation that if $A$ is an EJA and $X \subseteq A$, then for all $x \in X$, $U_x(J(X)) \subseteq J(X)$. This is evident from the fact that, as $x \in J(X)$ and the latter is a Jordan subalgebra of $A$, $U_x(y) = 2x \bullet (x \bullet y) - (x^2) \bullet y$ for all $y \in J(X)$.

Now consider that the proof of the identities $(a \otimes u) \bullet (x \otimes y) = a \bullet x \otimes y$ and $(u \otimes b) \bullet (x \otimes y) = x \otimes b \bullet y$ relies only on (a) and (b), and so, holds in our context. By Corollary 4.7, $U_{a \otimes u} = U_a \otimes \mathrm{id}$ and $U_{u \otimes b} = \mathrm{id}_A \otimes U_b$. If $a, b$ are interior elements, then $U_a \in G(A)$ and $U_b \in G(B)$, so by (b), we have

$$U_a \otimes U_b = (U_a \otimes \mathrm{id}_B) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes U_b) = U_{a \otimes u_B} \circ U_{u_A \otimes b}.$$

Since $U_{a \otimes u_B}$ and $U_{u_A \otimes b}$ preserve $J(A \otimes B) = A \odot B$, by the remark above, so does $U_a \otimes U_b$, and the proof is finished. $\square$

# F Extending order automorphisms

Let $A$ be an EJC-algebra, that is, $A$ a Jordan subagebra of $\mathbf{M}_{sa}$ for a finite-dimensional complex $*$-algebra $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_A$. Recall that $G(A)$ is the connected component of the identity in the group of order-automorphisms of $A$.

**Lemma F.1.** *Let $A$ be reversible. Then any one-parameter group of order automorphisms of $A$ extends to a one-parameter group of order-automorphisms of $\mathbf{M}$.*

*Proof:* If $\{\phi(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a one-parameter group of order-automorphisms of $A$, then $\phi(t)(a) = e^{tX}a$ where $X = \phi'(0)$ is a linear operator on $A$. By definition, $X$ is an order-derivation of $A$. Now, order-derivations come in two basic types: those having the form $X = L_a$ for some $a \in A$, and those having the property $Xu = 0$ (which turns out to be the same thing as being a Jordan derivation). The former are self-adjoint with respect to the canonical inner product on $A$, by the definition of a euclidean Jordan algebra, while the latter are skew-adjoint . Moreover, every order-derivation has the form $\delta = L_a + \delta'$ where $\delta'$ is skew ([3], Proposition 1.60).

Now, $L_a$ obviously extends from $A$ to $\mathbf{M}$, simply because $a \in \mathbf{M}$ and the Jordan product on $A$ is the restriction of that on $\mathbf{M}$. By ([38], Theorem 2.5), if $A$ is reversible in $\mathbf{M}$, $\delta'$ also extends to a Jordan derivation $\delta''$ on $\mathbf{M}$. Thus, we have an extension $\widehat{\delta} = L_a + \delta''$ on $\mathbf{M}$. In particular, $\delta''(A) \subseteq A$.

It follows that we have an order-automorphism $\widehat{\phi}(t) = e^{t\widehat{\delta}}$ of $\mathbf{M}_+$. Note that this preserves $A$, since

$$\widehat{\phi}(t)x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!}\widehat{\delta}^k x$$

and $\widehat{\delta}x = (L_a + \delta'')x = a \bullet x + \delta''(x)$, which belongs to $A$ if $x$ does. $\square$

**Corollary F.2.** *If $A$ is reversible, every element of $G(A)$ extends to an element of $G((\mathbf{M}_A)_{sa})$.*

Now let $B$ also be a reversible EJC-algebra.

**Lemma F.3.** *Let $\delta$ be any $*$-derivation of $\mathbf{M}_A$ fixing $A$. Then $\delta \otimes \mathbf{1}$ is a $*$-derivation of $\mathbf{M}_A \otimes \mathbf{M}_B$ fixing $A \odot B$.*

*Proof:* Let $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{N}$ be $*$-algebras, and let $a, b \in \mathbf{M}$ and $x, y \in \mathbf{N}$. Then

$$(a \otimes x) \bullet (b \otimes y) = \frac{1}{2}(ab \otimes xy + ba \otimes yx).$$

If $\delta$ is a $*$-derivation of $\mathbf{M}$, then it is straighforward to check that $\delta \otimes \mathbf{1}$ is a $*$-derivation of $\mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{N}$, and that for all $a, b \in \mathbf{M}$ and $x, y \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$(\delta \otimes \mathbf{1})((a \otimes x) \bullet (b \otimes y)) = (a \otimes x) \bullet (\delta(b) \otimes y) + (\delta(a) \otimes x) \bullet (b \otimes y).$$

In particular, if $A \subseteq \mathbf{M}$ and $\delta(A) \subseteq A$, it follows that $(\delta \otimes \mathbf{1})(A \otimes B) \subseteq (A \otimes B) \bullet (A \otimes B)$ for any $B \subseteq \mathbf{N}$. It follows easily that, where $A$ and $B$ are EJCs and $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_A$ and $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{M}_B$, $\delta \otimes \mathbf{1}$ preserves $A \odot B$. [18]

**Proposition F.4.** *If $\phi$ and $\psi$ are order-automorphisms of $A$ and $B$, respectively, then $\phi \otimes \psi$ extends to an order-automorphism of $A \odot B$.*

*Proof:* By Corollary F.2, we can assume that $\phi$ is an order-automorphism of $M_{sa}$ fixing $A$. Then $\phi = e^{\delta}$ for an order-derivation $\delta$ of $M$, which (taking derivatives) must also fix $A$. It follows that

$$\phi \otimes \mathbf{1} = e^{t\delta} \otimes \mathbf{1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{n!} \delta^n \otimes \mathbf{1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{n!} (\delta \otimes \mathbf{1})^n = e^{t(\delta \otimes \mathbf{1})}.$$

By Lemma F.3, $\delta \otimes \mathbf{1}$ fixes $A \odot B$; thus, so does the series at right, whence, so does $\phi \otimes \mathbf{1}$. It follows that if $\phi$ is an order-automorphism of $M_A$ fixing $A$, then $\phi \otimes \mathbf{1}$ is an order-automorphism of $A \otimes B$ fixing $J(A \otimes B) = A \odot B$. Hence, if $\phi$ and $\psi$ are order-automorphisms of $M_A$ and $M_B$, respectively fixing $A$ and $B$, then $\phi \otimes \psi = (\phi \otimes \mathbf{1}) \circ (\mathbf{1} \otimes \psi)$ fixes $A \odot B$. $\square$

[18] The details: let $\delta$ be a $*$-derivation on a $*$-algebra $\mathbf{M}$, and let $X \subseteq M_{sa}$ with $\delta(X) \subseteq X$. Let $Y = \{a \in J(X) | \delta(a) \in J(X)\}$. Evidently $X \subseteq Y$. Now if $a, b \in Y$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\delta(ta + b) = t\delta(a) + \delta(b) \in J(X)$, so $J(X)$ is a subspace of $M$. If $a, b \in Y$ then $\delta(a \bullet b) = a \bullet \delta(b) + \delta(a) \bullet b \in J(X)$. Thus, $Y$ is a Jordan subalgebra of $\mathbf{M}_{sa}$, containing $X$, and contained in $J(X)$. Ergo, $Y = J(X)$, and $\delta(J(X)) \subseteq J(X)$.